STUDIES IN THE BOOK OF *JONAH*

Phyllis Lou Trible

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
under the Joint Committee on
Graduate Instruction,
Columbia University

1963

ABSTRACT

Studies in the Book of Jonah

Phyllis Lou Trible

The purpose of the thesis is to understand the book of Jonah in the light of several biblical disciplines. It is assumed that there is a proper methodology which must be employed if a correct understanding is to be achieved. Thus a corollary purpose is to test the validity of this methodology.

First a thorough study of the text is made. It is based on Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Aramaic, and Syriac witnesses. The material from Murabba'at is also considered. We conclude that the text has been well preserved and transmitted.

Literary and historical issues are examined next. The prose section of the book is declared to be a unit; the Psalm in chapter 2 is shown to be a later insertion. We maintain that 4:5 is misplaced and belongs after 3:4. The book is placed in the post-exilic period, although it is impossible to determine which century. Linguistic peculiarities and the use of the prophet Jonah, of the city Nineveh, and of a sea-faring tale in Chapter 1 suggest that the provenance of the story is in northern Palestine.

A form critical analysis constitutes the bulk of the thesis. A survey of suggested Gattungen is made, and it is proposed that Jonah is best described as a midrashic legend. It is a fanciful commentary on an ancient cultic confession which is contained in Jonah's prayer of 4:2. Next the Literary Characteristics of the tale are carefully examined. It is seen that the legend is designed symmetrically with two major sections of approximately equal length (1:1-2:1,2,11 and 3:1-4:11). The themes of these two

sections correspond, as well as some of their vocabulary. The individual verses are studied for their form and structure. Stylistic and rhetorical devices are noted, such as repetitions, assonance, key words and phrases, and concentric patterns of sentence structure.

The impossibility of determining with certainty the original *Sitz im Leben* of *Jonah* is recognized. Nevertheless, clues provided in the content of the book are explored as they pertain to prophecy, to cult, and to wisdom literature. *Jonah* is shown to have many affinities with *hokmic* literature: its lack of a precise historical context; its cosmopolitan perspective; its didactic concern with nature; and its informal and humorous character These features may suggest an informal use and setting for the story in the *sodh* of post-exilic Israel.

The final chapter of the thesis is concerned with the meaning of this midrashic legend. The view that *Jonah* is a polemic against the nationalism of Nehemiah-Ezra is challenged on the basis that there is no evidence to link the story with the times of these men. While the universalism of the tale may *ipso facto* refute nationalism, it does not follow that it was composed explicitly for the purpose of attacking particularism. The book of *Jonah* transcends polemic. As a legend it embodies a variety of motifs: e.g., the nature of the prophetic call; the relationship between human and divine repenting; Yahweh's concern with great cities and with the world of nature; the lordship and power of Yahweh over all creation. The heart of the story is the proclamation that God is love (cf. 4:2). This love is manifested toward foreigners and towards the rebellious prophet himself.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Abbreviations

CHAPTER PAGE

I. The Text and Ancient Versions 1

- A. The Need for a Study of the Text 1
- B. Sources for a Study of the Text 4
- C. Examination of the Text 9
  - 1. Chapter 1 10
  - 2. Chapter 2 31
  - 3. Chapter 3 41
  - 4. Chapter 4 47
- D. Conclusions 57

II. Literary and Historical Issues 66

- Introduction 66
- A. Composition 66
  - 1. Nature of the Task 66
  - 2. Survey of the Major Theories 67
  - 3. Examination of the Evidence 75
    - a. The Psalm 75
    - b. The Divine Names 82
    - c. Other Matters 87
      - Chapter 1 87
      - Chapter 2 89
      - Chapter 3 89
      - Chapter 4 91
- B. Date 104
  - 1. Survey of Critical Opinions 104
  - 2. Evaluation of the Evidence 110
  - 3. Conclusion 116
- C. Provenance 116
- Conclusions 121

III. Form Critical Studies 122

- A. The Task of Form Criticism 122
  - 1. Nature and Purposes 122
  - 2. Difficulties 124
- B. Gattung 126
  - 1. Introduction 126

CHAPTER PAGE

- 2. *Jonah* as historical narrative 127
- 3. *Jonah* as non-historical narrative 130
    - a. General designations 130
    - b. Partial designations 131
        - (1) Myth 131
        - (2) Fable 143
        - (3) Folk-tale 144
    - c. Other possibilities 152
        - (1) Allegory 153
        - (2) Parable 158
        - (3) Midrash 161
        - (4) Legend 169
- 4. Conclusion 176

C. Literary Characteristics 177
- 1. *Jonah* as Legend 178
- 2. External Design 184
    - a. Introduction 184
    - b. The Book of Jonah: A Study in Symmetry . 186
    - c. Summary Comments 193
- 3. Internal Structure 202
    - a. Introduction 202
    - b. Section A: Chapters 1 and 2:1,2,11 . . 203
        - (1) The Introduction 203
        - (2) The Call and Response 204
        - (3) The Voyage at Sea 207
        - (4) The Episode of the Fish 218
    - c. Section B: Chapters 3 and 4 219
        - (1) Introduction, Call, Response . . 219
        - (2) Life in Nineveh 221
        - (3) A Closing Dialogue 229
- 4. Stylistic Characteristics 234
    - a. Use of Imagery 234
    - b. Sentences: structure and kinds 236
    - c. Vocabulary 238
    - d. Repetitions 239
    - e. Assonance 241
- 5. Conclusions 243

D. *Sitz im Leben* 244
- 1. *Jonah* and prophecy 245
- 2. *Jonah* and the cult 245
- 3. *Jonah* and wisdom literature 249
- 4. *Jonah* and the *Sodh* 259

IV. An Interpretation 262

- A. Nehemiah-Ezra and Particularism 262
- B. Motifs of the Legend 266
- C. The Heart of the Midrash 273

Bibliography 280

Preface

The purpose of this thesis is to understand the book of *Jonah* in the light of several biblical disciplines, viz. Textual Criticism, Literary Criticism, and Form Criticism. It is assumed that there is a proper methodology which must be employed if a correct understanding is to be achieved. Thus a corollary purpose of the thesis is to test the validity of this methodology.

This study is a selective one. Limitations of space make it impossible to examine all facets of *Jonah*. One notable omission is the kind of verse-by-verse exegesis already available in certain commentaries.[1] Moreover, once we have established to our satisfaction that the Psalm in Chapter 2 is an insertion rather than an integral part of the original story, we eliminate it from further consideration. A complete study of the Psalm would be in itself another thesis. Our primary concern, then, is with selected aspects of the narrative portion of *Jonah*.

The need for an examination of this book in the areas which we have chosen is suggested by a number of factors:

1) In recent years there has been no *detailed* work done on *Jonah*. While others of the Minor Prophets have been the subject of special studies,[2] *Jonah* has received no such attention.

---

[1] See, *inter alia*, Bewer, *Jonah*, ICC (1912); T. H. Robinson, HAT (1954), pp. 117-126; A. Weiser, *ATD* (1959), pp. 214-226; P. G. Rinaldi, "Giona," *I Profeti Minori* (1959), pp. 189-213; L. H. Brockington, "Jonah," *Peake's Commentary* (1962), pp. 627-629.

[2] Cf., e.g., on Joel: Kapelrud, *Joel Studies* (1948); on Nahum: Haldar, *Studies in the Book of Nahum* (1947); on Habakkuk: Humbert, *Problemes du livre d'Habacuc* (1944); on Zephaniah: Gerleman, *Zephania* (1942); on Malachi, see the forthcoming dissertation by Bruce T. Dahlberg (1963).

2) Within the last decade there have appeared a few articles and monographs devoted exclusively to Jonah.[1] The brevity of these works as well as certain of their insights combine to provide the need and impetus for more thorough investigations.

3) General advances in biblical scholarship yield tools and data which can increase and improve our knowledge of Jonah. The discovery of ancient mss in caves near the Dead Sea supply new material for our textual study. Expanding knowledge of Semitic languages, particularly researches in Ugaritic, shed light on linguistic peculiarities of our book as well as on the questions of date and provenance.

4) So far as we know, no thorough form critical analysis of Jonah has yet been undertaken. It is believed here that an application of form critical methods to the material can contribute immensely to an understanding of it. This relatively unexplored area offers the possibility of fresh interpretations. Thus about one-half of the thesis is devoted to this topic.

5) Very often Jonah is described as a protest against nationalism or as a missionary tract. We contend that these characterizations do not sufficiently comprehend the deeper dimensions of the story. It is necessary to re-examine the meaning of Jonah, especially in the light of our form critical discoveries.

The plan of the thesis is outlined in the Table of Contents.

---

[1] See esp. E. Haller, "Die Erzählung von dem Propheten Jona" (1958); H. W. Wolff, "Jonabuch," RGG III (1959) cols. 854-855; O. Loretz, "Herkunft und Sinn der Jona-Erzählung," BZ 5:1 (Jan. 1961),

Throughout wherever biblical quotations do not follow the text of the Revised Standard Version, they are our own translation.

18-29; N. Lohfink, "Jona ging zur Stadt hinaus (Jon 4,5)," BZ 5:2 (July, 1961), 185-203.

Abbreviations

Ach	Achminian
Aeth	Aethiopic
AF	Altorientalische Forschungen
AJSLL	*American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, edited by James B. Pritchard
Aq	Aquila
Arab	Arabic
AT	Alte Testament
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BASOR	Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research
BDB	Brown, Driver, and Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BH$_3$	*Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd edition, edited by R. Kittel
BS	*Bibliotheca Sacra*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
DB	*A Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
EB	*Encyclopaedia Biblica*
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FSAC	*From the Stone Age to Christianity* by W. F. Albright
G-K	*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch

GS	Greek Scroll of the Twelve
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IB	*The Interpreter's Bible*
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JE	*Jewish Encyclopedia*
JPOS	*Journal of Palestine Oriental Society*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
JTVI	*Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*
K-B	Koehler and Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*
LXX	Septuagint
Mp	Masora parva
ms	manuscript
mss	manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
Mur. 88	Murabba'at 88
NT	New Testament
NTT	*Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift*
OL	Old Latin
OT	Old Testament
OTMS	*The Old Testament and Modern Study*, edited by H. H. Rowley

PSBA	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*
PTR	*Princeton Theological Review*
Q	Codex Marchalianus
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
S	Peshitta
Sa	Sahidic
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
Sym	Symmachus
Syp	Syropalestinian
T	Targum
Th	Theodotian
Th.	Theodore of Mopsuestia
Tht.	Theodore of Cyrus
TR	*Theological Review*
TR	*Theologische Rundschau*
USQR	*Union Seminary Quarterly Review*
V	Latin Vulgate
v	verse
vs	verses
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

CHAPTER I

THE TEXT AND ANCIENT VERSIONS

Basic to all biblical study is the science of Lower Criticism. Its task to recover the original text[1] of Scripture is the prerequisite for literary, historical, form critical, and theological considerations. The necessity of this task derives from the fact that no original manuscripts of the Bible have survived. Available are many witnesses to the text, of varying ages and value. These the textual critic analyzes thoroughly, seeking thereby to arrive at the original, although recognizing at the same time that the original can never be established absolutely.[2] Würthwein states this procedure and purpose as follows:

> The traditional witnesses to the text must be examined so as to reconstruct from their evidence a text which may be assumed on scientific grounds to be the nearest possible to the original, or ideally, to be identical with it. Before interpretation, and bound up with it, there must therefore come the work of textual criticism.[3]

A. The Need for a Study of the Text

These introductory remarks set the stage for an analysis of the book of Jonah. Textual studies of this book are indeed few. Some commentators do not mention the state of the text or say simply that the text contains no major problems.[1] Their apparent neglect of the topic tends to imply that the matter of text is of little importance for understanding the book; or their generalizations tend *per se* to be misleading. Even a well-preserved text has not been perfectly preserved and uniformly transmitted. If for no other reason, differences ought to be delineated as a reminder that the *Urtext* can never be assumed positively.

---

[1] By the phrase 'original text' is not meant "...the recovery of the actual form in which the individual sentences were first conceived, but the form of the text which the Old Testament books had when they had already attained their present shape, as regards extent and content, and were becoming canonical, which happened with differences in detail from the fourth century B.C. onwards." (E. Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, p. 70).

[2] See D. W. Thomas, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," OTMS, p. 259.

[3] Würthwein, op. cit., p. 2.

Equally inadequate are general comments about specific witnesses to the text. A clear example is afforded by two divergent judgments made about the value of the LXX for *Jonah* studies. The first comes from Oesterley and Robinson: "The Septuagint is of little value so far as this book is concerned."[2] The second, from B. J. Roberts, cites *Jonah* as one book "where the LXX is of considerable help for restoring the MT."[3] Neither statement is substantiated.[4] Neither sheds any real light on the state of the text; each tends to cancel out the validity of the other.

A significant factor in deterring one from thorough study of the text of *Jonah* may stem from the critical notes provided in the third edition of *Biblia Hebraica*. In general H. M. Orlinsky has deplored the fact that many scholars mistakenly accept the data in BH_3 as both accurate and complete.[1] On the basis of these notes alone one might easily conclude that variants to the text of Jonah are indeed few and of relatively minor importance.[2] Such a conclusion would render any further textual investigation superfluous. As will be shown, however, there are numerous lacunae in the apparatus criticus attached to Jonah in BH_3; it is impossible to rely upon it for completeness.[3]

---

[1] E.g., S. R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the OT*, pp. 321-325; O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung* II, pp. 493-496; R. Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, pp. 586-589; A. Feuillet, "Le Livre de Jonas"; A. Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten* (hereafter referred to as ATD), pp. 214-226.

[2] W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *An Introduction to the Books of the OT*, p. 380.

[3] B. J. Roberts, *The OT Text and Versions*, p. 187.

[4] In all fairness the different contexts of these two statements ought to be noted. Oesterley and Robinson make their observation as part of a study of *Jonah* itself, while Roberts makes his in a paragraph designed as a general guide for determining the value of the Greek version of the Minor Prophets. In this latter instance one would not expect elaboration about *Jonah* specifically.

A searching examination of the text of Jonah was undertaken by Julius A. Bewer in 1912.[4] His commentary includes many notes on the Hebrew mss and the ancient versions. Yet the work can hardly be considered adequate now, since obviously it does not take account of recent ms discoveries. Moreover, along with textual observations Bewer has included literary judgments. This tendency to blur the distinction between Lower and Higher Criticism is perhaps a methodological defect of the study. To be sure, the two disciplines are related and in the final analysis go hand in hand in interpreting the meaning of the text. Nevertheless, a scientific study of the ms evidence is prior to and independent of other studies of the text;[1] it must precede scholarly hypotheses about composition, etc.[2] Thus, while Bewer's study is thorough, it is dated and not altogether properly presented.

---

[1] See his review of Würthwein, op. cit., in JSS IV (1959), 149-151; see also H. M. Orlinsky, "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research," The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, p. 151; ibid., "The Textual Criticism of the OT," The Bible and the Ancient Near East, pp. 114-116.

[2] Altogether 15 references are given in the apparatus criticus. Only 5 of these appear in the upper section of notes, which is concerned with variants. Of the 10 in the lower section, which has to do with scholarly emendations, 7 pertain to the Psalm in Chapter 2.

[3] See J. Ziegler, "Studien zur Verwertung der Septuaginta im Zwölfprophetenbuch," ZAW (1944), 107-120. Cf. P. Katz, "Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-century," The Background of the NT and its Eschatology, p. 198.

[4] J. Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jonah, ICC.

Another textual study of Jonah has been produced by N. H. Snaith.[3] Although later (1945) than Bewer's work, it also antedates recent ms discoveries. Written for "students who are reading Jonah as their first Hebrew text,"[4] it does not purport to be a complete examination of the subject. The notes presented are not strictly textual throughout; in addition to grammatical questions, they include exegetical and theological comments.

It would seem that an up-to-date and detailed study of the text of Jonah is in order: a study prior to and fundamental for all literary, historical, and theological considerations.

B. Sources for a Study of the Text

The sources for this study include Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Aramaic, and Syriac witnesses. The Hebrew text provided in BH_3 is ms B19^A from the Leningrad Public Library; it is commonly known as L.[5] Written in A.D. 1008, this ms is a copy of the ben Asher text of the tenth century A.D., a text decreed as standard by Maimonides.[1] An earlier witness of value is Codex Petropolitanus of the Prophets; it dates from A.D. 916.[2] A third important witness is the Hebrew Scroll of the Minor Prophets which was discovered in March, 1955, in a cave at Murabba'at. Referred to as Mur. 88, it was published just recently (1961) by P. Benoit *et al*.[3] At present our most ancient witness to the received text of the Hebrew, it is dated in the early part of the second century A.D., perhaps within ten years of the Council of Jamnia, A.D. 90.[4] Although the beginning and end of the Scroll are missing, a complete text of *Jonah* is preserved.[5] Finally, in addition to these witnesses, the student must also examine the ms variants cited by Kennicott,[6] de Rossi,[7] Baer,[8] and Ginsburg.[9]

---

[1] See E. M. Good, "Jots and Tittles and the Gospel," USQR XI, No. 1 (Nov. 1955), 40.

[2] Cf. the statement of Roberts, op. cit., p. 1: "The study of the Hebrew Bible text must be regarded as a subject independent of the history and early growth of the Old Testament books and also of the formation of the canon."

[3] N. H. Snaith, Notes on the Hebrew Text of Jonah. For a similar, but much older, introduction to the text, see J. Bachmann, "Jona and Haggai," Präparationen zu den Kleinen Propheten, Vol. 5, 1891.

[4] Snaith, op. cit., p. 5.

[5] Paul Kahle, Prolegomena to BH_3, pp. XXIX-XXXVII. Throughout this study both the terms BH_3 and MT refer to this ms.

---

[1] For further comments on the nature and importance of L, see Roberts, *op. cit*., pp. 80-83; Würthwein, *op. cit*., p. 9f; and Thomas, *op. cit*.,p. 247f.

[2] Hermann L. Strack, ed., *Prophetarum Posteriorum, Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus*. Before the advent of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this was our oldest biblical ms. See Kahle, *op. cit*., p. xxxiv, and Würthwein, *op. cit*., p.26.

[3] P. Benoit, J. T. Milik, et R. de Vaux, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, II. *Les Grottes de Murabba'at*.

[4] See the remarks of Milik; *ibid*., p. 69.

[5] For a complete report on the Scroll, see *ibid*., pp. 181-184. The text of *Jonah* is given on p. 190f, with additional comments on p. 181 and critical notes on p. 183f and p. 205.

[6] Benjamin Kennicott, *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus* (1776-1780).

[7] J. B. de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti* (1784/88).

[8] S. Baer, *Liber Duodecim Prophetarum. Textum Masoreticum Accuratissime Expressit* (1878).

[9] C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (1897).

Chief among the Greek translations to be consulted is the Septuagint, which, according to the Letter of Aristeas,[1] stems from the first half of the 3rd century B.C. The work of translation was carried on over a number of years, however, and it is generally believed that the section on the Prophets was not completed until c. 200 B.C.[2] It is well to remember that "no uniform text of the Septuagint circulated in the early church."[3] Thus there is really not one LXX but rather a diversity of Septuagintal mss which have to be studied.[4] These include the great Codices: Sinaiticus (ℵ) and Vaticanus (B), belonging to the 4th century A.D., and Alexandrinus (A) of the 5th century A.D.[5] Among the earlier Septuagintal mss is the Freer Collection of the Minor Prophets, often referred to as the Washington Ms (W). First published in 1927, these mss probably date from the latter half of the 3rd century A.D.[6] Although sections of certain prophetic books are missing, the text of Jonah remains intact.

---

[1] For an evaluation of the worth of this Letter see Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 101-103.

[2] Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

[3] A. Jeffery, "Text and Ancient Versions of the Old Testament," IB I, p. 59.

[4] The classic collation of Septuagintal mss is the work of Robert Holmes and James Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, 1798-1827. As for printed editions of the LXX, the convenient two-volume edition by Rahlfs (*Septuaginta*) is inadequate because of its eclectic nature. Of great importance is the Göttingen Septuagint of the Twelve, with elaborate *apparati*; see Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta*, Vol. XIII, *Duodecim Prophetae* (1943). The text of *Jonah*, with notes, is on pp. 244-253.

[5] For a general description and evaluation of these and other mss, see Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 149-161.

[6] Henry A. Sanders and Carl Schmidt, *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis* (1927). The question of date is discussed on pp. 10-12. The text of *Jonah* is presented on pp. 90-95, with critical notes on pp. 183-188. See now Herbert C. Youtie, "A Codex of Jonah," HTR 38 (1945), 195-197.

Septuagintal studies have also been aided by recent ms discoveries. In the summer of 1952 Bedouin of Ta'amireh found a number of mss in a cave in the wilderness of Judea.[1] Among them was a leather scroll of the Minor Prophets in Greek. Barthélemy and Cross provisionally identify this text with the Quinta of the Hexapla, which itself is a revision of the LXX by a late pre-Christian Hebrew text.[2] This Scroll, then, is not an original version but a recension of the LXX. Barthélemy assigns it to the end of the first century B.C.[3] Although this text of the Twelve has not survived in its entirety, the book of Jonah is extant.[4]

Three Greek translations of the 2nd century A.D. consulted in this study are those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotian.[5] They have been preserved in Origen's Hexapla, produced between 230 and 240 A.D.[6]

The Vulgate is another important version to examine. Although it was preceded by Old Latin translations, they are generally considered "of only second or perhaps even third rate importance for the immediate needs of the criticism of the Massoretic text...."[1] Unlike all other versions, the Vulgate is definitely the work of one man, Jerome. This translation of the entire OT, prepared between A.D. 390-405, is based on the Hebrew text, even though the influence of other translations is apparent in it.[2] Especially relevant to our study is Pfeiffer's observation that in the Prophets Jerome "often deliberately accepted the rendering of the Greek versions."[3] Accordingly, one cannot rely upon the Vulgate as always presenting a translation of a Hebrew text.

---

[1] For an account of this discovery, see F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, especially p. 20f.

[2] Ibid., p. 129. D. Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," RB 60 (1953), 18-29.

[3] Ibid., p. 19.

[4] This text has not yet been published. Available for this study are only those references to Jonah which are cited by Barthélemy, op. cit. and by Vogt, "Fragmenta Prophetarum minorum deserti Iuda," Biblica 34 (1953), 423-26.

[5] See Roberts, op. cit., pp. 120-127 and Würthwein, op. cit., pp. 37-39.

[6] Fred Field, ed., Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt, II, 1875. Variants for Jonah are given on pp. 984-987. On the date of the Hexapla, see Würthwein, op. cit., p. 39.

Two remaining versions can be considered briefly. First is Targum Jonathan, the official Aramaic translation of the Prophets which, according to the Babylonian Talmud, is the work of Jonathan bar-Uzziel in the first century A.D.[4] There are indications, however, that the translation is a composite one and is not to be dated so early.[5] The value of the Aramaic for textual studies is decreased not only by its relatively late date but also by the fact that it often paraphrases rather than translates.[6]

---

[1] Roberts, op. cit., p. 245. A compilation of the OL Texts of the Twelve, indicating clearly the various sources on which it is based, has been prepared by W. O. E. Oesterley, "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," JTS V (1904-05). The Prefactory Note is to be found on pp. 76-79; the text of Jonah on pp. 378-381.

[2] Würthwein, op. cit., pp. 64-67. [3] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 125.

[4] Roberts, op. cit., p. 208.

[5] Idem. See also Würthwein, op. cit., p. 38.

[6] Roberts, op. cit., pp. 196, 208. The editions of Targum Jonathan used in this study of Jonah are The Bible in Aramaic, III, edited by A. Sperber (1962), pp. 436-439; the Codex Reuchlinianus (c. 1105), edited by P. Lagarde, Prophetae Chaldaice (1872); and the collated text provided by W. Wright in The Book of Jonah in Four Semitic Versions (1857), pp. 1-4.

Perhaps of even less usefulness than the Aramaic is the Syriac text of *Jonah*. At the outset the student is hampered by the fact that there is not available a totally adequate edition of the Peshitta.[1] Besides, the rendering of the Syriac text varies considerably from book to book so that no over-all evaluation is really possible. This translation is certainly the work of many men over a long period of time. Other problems center in the origin of the work, be it Jewish or Christian, in its date and in the influence of the LXX upon it. Of particular interest for this study are two different judgments about the Peshitta of the Minor Prophets. Roberts claims that "for the most part" it is "fairly freely translated."[2] Pfeiffer maintains that it has been revised very definitely to conform with the LXX.[3] While the Peshitta must be examined, it is not a primary witness to the text.

C. Examination of the Text

That part of the *Masora Finalis* included in BH_3 states that *Jonah* has 48 verses (ארבעים ושמונה פסוקים). According to Ginsburg, all the known Hebrew mss agree on this point.[4] A second piece of information supplied by the Masora is that *Jonah* has no Seder (לית ביה סדרא).[5]

---

[1] Würthwein, *op. cit.*, p. 61. The following editions were consulted for the text of *Jonah*: S. Lee, ed., *Vetus Testamentum Syriace* (1823); Wright, *op. cit.*, pp. 47-50. Cf. H. A. Grimm, ed., "Jonae et Obadiae Oracula Syriace" (1805), pp. 1-18. Use has been made of a critical study of the Twelve done by M. Sebök in 1887; he examined the Syriac in relation to the MT, LXX, and T: *Die syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten*. See also C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum*, 1928.

[2] Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

[3] Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

[4] Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

[5] The text of the Clausula of *Jonah* reads: "The number of the verses of the book of Jonah is forty and eight; and the sign is ח"ם . And its middle point is, When my soul fainted within me (Jonah 2[8]). And there is in it neither paragraph nor section. And there should be left a space of

This book was considered only a part of one designated reading from the Minor Prophets, which altogether have 21 Sedarim.[1]

Chapter 1

Verse 1: All the witnesses preserve this opening v essentially the same, with the exception of T. It paraphrases the beginning: והוה פתגם נבואה מן קדם יוי עם יונה.

אל־יונה בן־אמתי : Two translations of this phrase are found in the Greek: Aq, Sym, and Th render it literally, προς Ιωναν τον υιον -μ-θ--. LXX[2] drops υιον and substitutes the genitive article: προς Ιωναν τον του Αμαθι.[3] The orthography of the proper names varies. Characteristic of W is the spelling ιωνα ,

---

three lines between each book; so according to the Massorah in Ar. Or. 16; but in all the manuscripts there is a paragraph in the book of Jonah; see 3^1" (Geden and Kilgour, Introduction to the Ginsburg Edition of the Hebrew OT, p. 74).

[1] Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 54. A word of caution must be entered here concerning the use and interpretation of the Masoretic data. The older view, held by Ginsburg, was that there was only one Masora, which was a corpus of material collected from all available sources; it was by and large uniform in all mss. Deviations from it were the results of mistakes in transmission and hence required correction. On the basis of this assumption, then, Ginsburg can speak dogmatically of "the Massorah which says at the end of Jonah...it has no Seder." These few mss which record different information he terms "variations" of or "departures from the Massorah" (p. 53). Actually, the assumption of only one Masora is erroneous; recent studies have shown that each Biblical ms has its own particular Masora. "A Massorah is of no use except for the manuscript to which it pertains..." (Roberts, op. cit., p. 72). Suffice it here to record that while the Masora finalis of most mss concur that Jonah has no Sedar, a few say otherwise. Ginsburg himself cites the Yemen recension which has only 19 Sedarim in the Minor Prophets and makes the tenth one Jonah 4:11 (p. 53). Baer (op. cit.) gives still another Masora, this one marking as the ninth Seder Jonah 1:1, rather than the customary Obadiah 21.

[2] The use of "LXX" refers to all the major Septuagintal witnesses; instances where these differ significantly will be specifically pointed out.

[3] The form "_____ τον του _____" (i.e., withoutυιον) is by no means unusual in the LXX. It would seem to be one characteristic way of translating the phrase "______, son of ______" (e.g., Hosea 1:1;

minus the proper case ending(s).[1] S reads the same: ܝܘܢܢ. These variations are of no consequence. Important differences, however, do exist in the name אמתי. Some Hebrew mss have protected the vocalization by writing the word *plene*, אמיתי.[2] In spite of this, the Greek witnesses, with the exception of Th, make the middle vowel *alpha*, and they diverge on the form of the ending. LXX and Aq: ʼΑμαθι ; Sym: ʼΑμαθαι ; Th: ʼΕμεθαι; and W: αμαθει. While T agrees with MT (אֲמִתַּי) and V agrees with LXX (*Amathi*), S differs from all of these in its dropping of the initial weak consonant: ܡܬܝ (=Gk. Ματθαιος ; cf. Arabic متى).[3]

Verse 2: With a few minor variations,[4] the Hebrew mss are in substantial agreement.

קום לך : According to Mp, קום appears nine times at the beginning of a verse;[5] see, e.g., Jon. 3:2. LXX and V have inserted, respectively, και and *et* between these two imperatives, perhaps thereby modifying idiomatic Hebrew to fit their own patterns of speech.

Joel 1:1). That it is not the only way, however, can be seen in comparable phrases in Zephaniah 1:1 and in Zechariah 1:1, where υιον is expressed.

[1] We shall not call attention to each of the 11 occurrences of the form ιωνα in W: see Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 183. Furthermore, W receives specific mention throughout only where it disagrees with LXX.

[2] See Kennicott.

[3] There is no evidence to indicate S was reading a different text; in II Kings 14:25, the only other occurrence of this proper name, it is rendered again by S with the omission of the initial *aleph*. See Sebök, *op. cit.*, p. 44, note 1.

[4] E.g., Kennicott records a defective reading of ננוה in five mss and of הגדלה in thirteen. From here on, no notice will be taken of *plene* and *defectiva* forms *per se*; these variations occur frequently but are of relatively little importance.

[5] The Mp used in this study is that of BH_3; it applies only to this text.

העיר הגדולה : Like the Hebrew, the LXX stresses the greatness and uniqueness of Nineveh by use of the definite article (την πολιν την μεγαλην). This emphasis is missing in T (קרתא רבתא) and in S (ܡܕܝܢܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ), where, unlike the Latin, it would be possible to maintain it.

וקרא עליה : This imperative, a form appearing four times in the OT (Mp),[1] is paraphrased in T as the command 'prophesy' (ואתנבי). Jerome uses the verb praedico, 'to make publicly known' (imperative= praedica). The preposition על embodies a variety of meanings,[2] and the meaning intended here cannot be determined precisely, even by the context. T and S have the same preposition with its wide spectrum of meanings; hence, they only confirm the ambiguity inherent in the Hebrew. On the other hand, LXX and V definitely read in: εν αυτη ; in ea.

כי־עלתה : The meaning of כי is also difficult to determine. It may introduce indirect discourse, supplying the content of the prophet's message, and be translated by that; or it may introduce a causal clause, giving the reason for the message, and be translated by because or since.[3] The versions use words which have this double meaning also: LXX: οτι ; V: quia; T: ארי ; and S: ܡܛܠ ܕ .[4]

---

[1] See, besides Jon. 1:2 and 3:2, Job 13:22 and Ruth 4:11.

[2] E.g., it may mean "call to her" or "call concerning her" or "call against her"; see BDB, pp. 752-758; K-B, pp. 703-705. On the confusion of על and אל (cf. 3:2) see Bewer, op. cit., p. 31.

[3] Cf. BDB, pp. 471-475 and K-B, pp. 431-433 for its possible uses and meanings.

[4] For the uses of ὅτι, see W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT, pp. 592-594; Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek NT, passim. On the meanings of quia, see Harper's Latin Dictionary, p. 1510f. K-B lists behold and because as the possible meanings of ארי (op. cit., p. 1053; cf. also

רעתם לפני : T and S follow the MT. LXX and V change the plural suffix to a singular: αυτης and malitia eius, although some Greek mss maintain the plural αυτων (SypAeth Th.Tht.).[1] The plural of the MT may pose some difficulty here, especially since previous references to Nineveh have been in the singular. On the basis of consistency, one might expect the form רעתה , to which LXX and V testify. The repeated occurrence of ה as a final consonant in this v might tend to influence a final ה on this word, but such is not the case.[2] All Hebrew mss consulted preserve the plural suffix, a fact which reinforces the general textual rule that the more difficult reading is to be preferred. One cannot expect consistency in the use of the singular and plural in Hebrew. As attested in Ugaritic materials, these forms are flexible and are sometimes used interchangeably.[3] Furthermore, the plural suffix here may refer to the inhabitants of Nineveh. In the ancient Near East the city is considered as a human being.[4]

The LXX paraphrases: η κραυγη της κακιας αυτης. Variations in other Greek mss include: η κακια της κραυγης[5] and η κραυγη της κατοικιας[6]

Wright, op. cit., p. 9, who gives that and because. It is possible that the Syriac more definitely indicates cause than indirect discourse; see the notes on this word in Wright, op. cit., p. 62.

[1] Ziegler, Septuaginta, p. 244.

[2] One might also argue hypothetically that the final mem has crept into the text under the influence of the form עמהם in v 3. The proximity of these words might point to a scribal error in copying ם instead of ה in the first word, i.e., רעתם. Actually, however, there is no textual evidence to support this view; nor is it really necessary to explain away the mem.

[3] Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugaritic Manual, 13.15; 13.16 (p. 93).

[4] Cf., e.g., Lamentations 1:1ff; "Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur," ANET, pp. 455-463.

[5] See H-P and Ziegler, Septuaginta, p. 244.

[6] Still another variant listed by H-P retains the Hebrew plural

These may be attempts to clarify the MT, i.e., Yahweh knows the wickedness of Nineveh because he has heard its noise.

Verse 3: לברח : Kennicott notes one ms which has the imperfect ויברח .[1] Instead of the infinitive, V uses an ut construction to express purpose: ut fugeret.[2] One Syriac ms adds ܘܠܪܘܡ after the infinitive.

תרשישה : Mp says this form occurs four times. One may inquire whether this number refers to the entire OT, to the book of the Twelve, or only to Jonah. Three occurrences are definitely in Jonah (1:3,3; 4:2). A fourth time the word appears in Jonah (also 1:3) minus the ה directive, even though it would seem required grammatically. In light of the fact that over 15 Hebrew mss do give this fourth form in Jonah with the ה directive, it may be that in the present text the reading תרשיש is incomplete. It is possible that originally a ה was present, which may have inadvertently been dropped or misplaced. Either possibility may be supported somewhat by the presence of a final ה in several of the words surrounding תרשיש: אניה , באה , שכרה . Note that in the last two instances final ה is superfluous.[3] Be that as it may, our Masoretic note applies to the text as it stands; accordingly, the fourth occurrence of

---

suffix but paraphrases לפני : ανεξη η κακια αυτων εως το ορανο.

[1] This imperfect parallels ויקם, and the two stand in the same relationship to each other as do the two imperatives at the beginning of v 2.

[2] Since it is characteristic in Jonah for the Latin to render Hebrew infinitives of purpose by an ut construction, each occurrence of this phenomenon will not be pointed out.

[3] The use of the ה directive was a matter of dispute between Palestinian and Babylonian scribes, perhaps as early as the third century. The former group used the sign arbitrarily. For this reason one cannot make too much of its presence or absence in the text. See esp. Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 197f.

תרשישה is in Isaiah 23:6.

Throughout this verse T nowhere uses the word Tarshish but rather ימא . Bewer claims that a general meaning of Tarshish is sea.[1] W alone among the Greek witnesses omits the entire section from the end of the first Tarshish to the end of the second, an omission due no doubt to homoeoteleuton.

מלפני יהוה : A phrase occurring eight times, two of which are in this v (Mp). T paraphrases מן קדם דיתנבי בשמא דיוי.[2]

וירד יפו : There is no ה directive on יפו, even though it might be expected. The Greek witnesses vary in their spelling of this place name. The Septuagintal mss read εις 'Ιοππην.[3] Aq, Sym, and Th have εις οφιη.

אניה | באה : While the masculine noun אֳנִי signifies a fleet of ships, the feminine indicates a single ship (G-K 122t). This word is followed by a paseq or note-line, whose function in the text is not always identifiable.[4] Here it may call attention to the somewhat unusual form בָּאָה, which the Masoretes themselves comment upon as occurring 11 times in the OT with the accent placed on the last syllable.(See e.g., I Kgs. 14:5,6; Ez. 1:4; 7:6; 24:14; 33:3; Esth. 2:13.). This accent indicates an active qal participle rather than the 3rd qal perfect.[1] Its use is that of *futuram instans* and thus the form means "about to go" (G-K 116d). It is also unusual for this verb to be used in terms of going away rather than of coming in.[2]

---

[1] Bewer, op. cit., p. 31.

[2] This Targum paraphrase may be assumed each time the phrase occurs; it will not be pointed out specifically again. Churgin suggests that by the use of this phrase the translator may have been attempting to account for the flight of the prophet (Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, p. 108).

[3] Ziegler cites one variation in Codex א : ιππην.

[4] James Kennedy, The Note-Line in the Hebrew Scriptures, p. 5. According to Kennedy, the general purpose of the note-line is "to call attention to a note-worthy reading." Cf. also G-K, 15f n^2.

תרשיש : Codex א omits all from here to the end of the third Tarshish, no doubt due to *homeoteleuton*, as in W *supra*.[3]

שכרה : The feminine suffix is strange. T has the same (אגרה), but LXX and V interpret that Jonah paid his fare: το ναυλον αυτου ; *naulum eius*. S does not express the suffix at all. W_3 erases το ναυ to replace it by διαπλον (for διαπλουν), which Sanders suggest is "an attempted correction from the Hebrew."[4]

לבוא : LXX interprets the travel as sailing: πλευσαι.

עמהם : The more usual form seems to be עמם. Although עמהם occurs chiefly in late passages,[5] it is not necessarily a late form.[6] It is attested in Ugaritic, where *hm* is the 3rd person plural pronominal suffix.[7]

מלפני יהוה : Before this final phrase S repeats the infinitive 'to flee': ܠܡܥܪܩ.

---

[1] Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[2] Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 10; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 31; BDB, p. 97ff. Whereas the unusual features noted above about the form באה are sufficient to explain the presence of the note-line, another possibility bears mentioning. According to Gesenius, one purpose of *paseq* is to divide "identical or very similar words" (p. 60 n). Observe the similar letters in אניה באה.

[3] Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 183; Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 244.

[4] Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 183.

[5] BDB, p. 767; G-K 103c.

[6] It appears also in Deut. 29:16 and in Numbers 22:12 (JE); See Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[7] Gordon, *op. cit.*, 6.1, p. 30.

Verse 4: וַֽיהוָ֗ה : The verb usually comes first in Hebrew sentence structure. Mp notes that only 6 times does this form, with the same accent, occur at the beginning of a v; see, e.g., Joel 2:11; I Kgs. 5:26. V recognizes this obvious emphasis by the use of autem rather than merely of et: Dominus autem....

רוח גדולה : LXX omits the adjective; Sym reads πνευμα μεγα.

סער : This masculine form is found 8 times in OT; the feminine סערה is more frequent.[1] LXX translates by κλυδων, 'billow' or 'surf'.

חִשְּׁבָה לְהִשָּׁבֵר : The phrase literally means 'thought to break in pieces'. LXX renders εκινδυνευεν συντριβηναι 'ran the risk of being crushed, shattered'. Other Greek witnesses use the infinitive διαλυθηναι, 'of being destroyed'; T: לאתברא, 'sought to break in pieces' (Bewer's translation); S: ܡܬܗܦܟܐ ܗܘܬ ܠܡܬܬܒܪܘ, 'was on the point of being broken'; and V: periclitabatur conteri, 'was in danger of being destroyed'.

G. R. Driver finds the pointing חִשְּׁבָה most difficult to accept, as he claims the Greek and Latin witnesses also did.[2] He holds that the Masoretes have substituted here a piel for a pual, since they were not acquainted with this latter form. Driver suggests repointing the word as a pual: חֻשְּׁבָה (i.e., "and the ship was reckoned to be breaking up"). This proposal is unnecessary.[3] The piel form may well be employed deliberately to attribute animated feeling to the ship. Moreover, the alliteration in the phrase חִשְּׁבָה לְהִשָּׁבֵר may tend to support the pointing of MT (see our form-critical remarks *infra*, Chapter III).

---

[1] BDB, op. cit., p. 704.

[2] G. R. Driver, "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," Studies in OT Prophecy, p. 69f.

[3] Another proposal has been made by D. N. Freedman ("Note on Jonah 1:4b," JBL 77 (1958), 161f). He argues (1) that the LXX is probably based

Verse 5: ויראו המלחים : Syrohexapla has the additional words φοβψ μεγαλψ, no doubt under the influence of v 10. Origen rightly indicates that they are to be excised.

ויזעקו : A few mss read ויצעקו ;[1] the two verbs are parallel in Hebrew.[2]

איש אל־אלהיו : T and S follow MT in keeping this phrase in the singular. LXX mixes singular and plural: εκαστος προς τον θεον αυτων ; V has a plural noun: *viri ad deum suum*. T adds: וחזו ארי לית בהון צרוך , 'and they observed that there is not among them usefulness', *i.e.*, that it is of no use.

ויטלו : A *hapax legomenon* (Mp). LXX translates by two words: εκβολην εποιησαντο , literally, 'throwing out they did'.

את־הכלים : The noun is the plural of כלי , 'utensil'. LXX translates σκευων , one minuscule adding αυτων .[3]

One variant cited by Holmes-Parson inserts between the relative clause אשר ... מעליהם and the independent clause beginning ... ויונה ירד another clause not attested elsewhere: και εγενετο κλυδων μεγας εν τη θαλασση . It bears the stamp of a commentary

---

on a different Heb *Vorlage* from MT; (2) that the underlying reading was a form of the verb חוב , 'be sentenced, doomed' (cf. MT and LXX of Dan. 1:10); (3) that חשבה is "a 'correction' or corruption of חבה ."

[1] See Kennicott. [2] BDB, pp. 277, 858; K-B, p. 263.

[3] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 244.

which, perhaps inadvertently, has crept into this one Greek text.

ויונה : Like the appearance of ויהוה in 1:4, this syntax is unusual and certainly points up a contrast between the actions of the sailors and the response of Jonah to the same situation. LXX may take note of this contrast in translating the waw as δε ; similarly S may show the contrast by ܕܝܢ. T simply has waw. V has merely et, whereas in the case of ויהוה it alone among the versions recognizes the intended emphasis by the use of autem (cf. v 4).

אל־ירכתי הספינה : T reads: לארעית שדא דבאלפא 'to the bottom the side of the ship'. Not the usual Hebrew word for ship, הספינה is a hapax legomenon.[1]

וישכב וירדם : The Versions render this phrase in various ways: LXX: και εκαθευδεν και ερρεγχεν;[2] other Greek witnesses add εκει after the first verb. T uses a verb and participial form: ושכיב ודמוך . S has simply the one verb ܘܕܡܟ. V clarifies the meaning of רדם : et dormiebat sopore gravi. As Mp indicates, the form וַיֵּרָדַם appears 5 times in OT. On the pointing of it Gesenius comments, "Instead of the Ṣere in the ultima of the imperfect, Pathaḥ often occurs in pause" (51m).

Verse 6: ויקרב: Whereas ויקרא is found in a few mss,[3] the root קרב is well attested elsewhere. The Greek witnesses translate it by προσηλθε(ν), with the exception of Th, which reads κατεβη .

---

[1] See Snaith, op. cit., p. 13.

[2] James G. S. S. Thomson observes that the Heb root rdm caused much trouble for the Greek translators. To translate the 14 occurrences of it in the OT, the LXX uses 9 different words. Only in Jon. 1:5,6 is the verb ρεγχω used ("Sleep: An Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," VT 5 (1955), 421f). Cf., e.g., Gen. 2:21 where the noun rdm is rendered by εκστασις.

[3] See Kennicott and de Rossi.

רב החבל : It has been proposed that one would expect the plural החבלים here instead of the singular חבל . Kennedy suggests that this singular is an example of Hebrew abbreviation.[1] It is possible, however, that no omission actually occurs here and that the singular is intentionally employed in a collective sense (G-K 123 a,b). Gordon observes that in Ugaritic "the simple stem of a noun may be used to indicate plurality or indefinite number."[2] Finally, the correctness of this Hebrew singular is supported by similar examples in Jonah 3:4 and 4:11, q.v.

T and S follow the MT closely, reading רב ספניא and ܪܒ ܡܠܚܐ; respectively. LXX says simply ο πρωρευς ; other Greek witnesses use ο κυβερνητης ; V: gubernator.

מה־לך נרדם : The form נרדם is probably not a vocative, in which case it would more than likely have the article attached (G-K 126c). It is a niphal participle which serves as a complement to the verb understood in the phrase מה־לך .[3] Thus it is to be translated, "What do you mean, sleeping?" The Versions handle this in different ways: LXX changes the participle to a verb: Τι συ ρεγχεις.[4] V is more expansive and somewhat interpretive: Quid tu sopore deprimeris? T and S are similar in preserving a participial construction: מא את דמוך and ܡܢܐ ܐܢܬ ܕܡܟ.

יתעשת האלהים לנו : The root עשת means 'to think'. The expression is perhaps somewhat awkward; Mp observes that the form is a hapax. The Hebrew has been preserved in V: recogitet Deus de nobis. The other versions interpret: LXX and S use the verb 'deliver' or 'save': διασωση ο θεος ημας ; ܢܦܪܩܢ ܐܠܗܐ.[1] T paraphrases still further not only by changing the verb from 'thinking' to 'have compassion' but also by using the Tetragrammaton: יתרחם מן קדם יוי עלנא.

---

[1] "In Jon 1/16 /sic/, the singular form הַחֹבֵל instead of the plural ('the sailors') which is rather to be expected, may be due to the fuller omission of ים from the end of the word" (Kennedy, Textual Amendment, p. 174).

[2] Gordon, op. cit., 13.15, p. 93.

[3] G-K 120b; for its pointing, see G-K 68c.

[4] H-P cite one variant: τι σοι τουτο οτι ρεγχεις.

ולא נאבד : The negation placed between the waw and the verb in this final clause does not impair the consecutive form (G-K 109g, 165a, 166a). LXX uses a passive verb: και μη απολωμεθα .

Verse 7: ויאמרו איש אל־רעהו : Only T preserves literally the Hebrew syntax, with its mixture of singular and plural forms. Other versions change the verb to the singular. Mp states that וַיֹּאמְר֞וּ is found with this same accent 6 times at the beginning of a verse (e.g., Jer. 42:2). רעהו is contracted from the full form רעיהו (G-K 84^{a}i).

לכו : This qal imperative is substituted by the adverb δευτε in LXX.

גורלות : This word belongs to that class of masculines which form their plural by what is usually the feminine plural ending, ־ות (G-K 87p,r). That there is not always strict distinction in gender between the plural endings is a phenomenon attested also in Ugaritic.[2]

בשלמי : A composite word consisting of the preposition ב, plus an abbreviated form of the relative אשר, plus the preposition ל with the interrogative מי.[3] It is more common in Aramaic and Syriac than in

---

[1] Note that S omits the article before the divine appellative.

[2] "Some nouns, both m. and f., without the f. ending in the sg., take the f. suffix in the pl." Gordon, op. cit., 8.8, p. 44.

[3] BDB, p. 84.

Hebrew, although these languages do not have it here. The presence of למי turns the whole word into an interrogative, i.e., 'on account of whom?' (G-K 150K). LXX translates it by the phrase τινος ενεκεν and V by the adverb quare, but neither indicates the interrogative.

לנו : LXX renders the phrase εν ημιν, as if the Hebrew were בָּנוּ. Kennedy suggests that the confusion of these prepositions is understandable, since ל and ב "show considerable resemblance in some of the more modern Semitic alphabets."[1]

Verse 8: הגידה־נא : Aq, Sym, and Th, but not LXX, preserve the little particle נא by the corresponding δη . It is not retained in V and S; T translates it by כען.

באשר למי־הרעה הזאת לנו : This entire section is not only missing in several Hebrew mss,[2] but more importantly it is not present in codices א and B. Its initial words are the equivalent of בשלמי in the preceding verse. Mp notes that the form באשר is to be found 15 times (see, e.g., Gen. 39:9,23; Is. 47:12; 56:4; 65:12; 66:4; Ecc. 3:9; 7:2; 8:4). The phrase באשר למי is awkward. Bewer finds it "so singular and clumsy that it can only be regarded as an explanation of בשלמי ...."[3] The awkwardness of this word, as well as the absence of the entire phrase from reliable mss, probably indicates that the phrase is not a part of the original text.[4]

---

[1] Kennedy, Textual Amendment, p. 42f.

[2] See Kennicott and de Rossi.

[3] Bewer, op. cit., p. 37; see also S. R. Driver, Introduction, p. 475, who compares the word to אשר בשל of Ecc. 8:17 and אשר למה of Dan. 1:10.

[4] But cf. P. Joüon ("Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu," Biblica 10 (1929), 418) who notes that T reads מה (= מא) here instead of מי, thereby producing a different question from that of 1:7b, i.e., "Why (a cause de quori) has this evil come upon us?"

ומאין תבוא : This question is omitted in V. S understands here the verb 'to be'[1] rather than 'to come'. Some LXX mss add the question που πορευη , which Origen correctly indicates is to be omitted.

ואי־מזה : The first variation[2] between the MT and Mur. 88 appears here. In the latter, where the maqqeph is not employed at all, these words are run together: ואימזה . Kennicott also lists one ms where the same phenomenon occurs.

Verse 9: ויאמר אליהם : S alone inserts the name of Jonah.

עברי אנכי : The word עברי is a gentilic adjective with the derivative suffix ִי ; this suffix is often added to names of people (i.e., Eber) and thereby converts them to tribal names (G-K 26, 86h). In the LXX this word has been read as עבד (daleth instead of resh) plus י , an abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton,[3] and hence translated δουλος κυριου. S. Talmon holds that LXX preserves the original reading and that עברי is the mistake of copyist who thought the yodh was a first person possessive pronoun.[4] This explanation does not take sufficient account of the letter resh. With one exception only,[5] all Hebrew mss read עברי . Likewise, Aq, Sym, and Th translate Ἑρραιος εγω ειμι ; also V and S: Hebraeus ego sum; ܥܒܪܝܐ ܐܢܐ . T similarly uses a characteristic designation for the people of Israel in post-biblical times: יהודאה אנא. Clearly the weight of these witnesses supports the MT against LXX.

---

[1] For this usage, see Wright, op. cit., p. 52.

[2] By variations we do not intend to include the lacunae in the Jonah text of Mur. 88.

[3] See E. König, Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik, p. 248; M. Delcor, "Manieres d'Ecrire le Tetragramme Sacre," RHR 147 (1955), 155f.

[4] S. Talmon, "A Case of Abbreviation Resulting in Double Readings," VT IV (1954), 206-208.

[5] Kennicott 173 reads עבךי .

It is impossible to decide whether the reading of LXX is intentional or accidental. It may be a deliberate attempt to make Jonah's statement less nationalistic and/or openly confessional. It may be only an error in transcription.[1]

אלהי השמים : To this phrase a few Greek mss add και της γης .[2] No Hebrew mss contain the latter phrase, nor do any of the versions record it. One can understand how it might have been appropriately inserted into a given text.

אני־ירא : Some Greek mss render this participle by the verb 'to worship'; σεβομαι .[3] Codex א , plus other Greek mss, read φοβουμαι , which seems the more accurate in context. All the versions agree on the use of the verb 'fear'. While the Hebrew root ירא does often indicate reverence and worship,[4] so to understand it in this context seems improbable.[5]

את־הים ואת־היבשה : One Greek minuscle reads τον ουρανον και την γην in place of την θαλασσαν και την ξηραν .[6]

---

[1] See Kennedy, *Textual Amendment*, p. 173.

[2] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 245.

[3] As suggested for the δουλος κυριου of 1:9, this rendering may be another attempt to make Jonah's reply confessional.

[4] BDB, p. 431.

[5] Further, in every other instance in *Jonah* where this word occurs (e.g., 1:5,10), the Greek translations are unanimous in employing the verb φοβεω.

[6] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 246.

The substitution of heaven for sea may have come about through the influence of the phrase "God of heavens" which occurs earlier in this verse; and γης, while not incorrect, is certainly less precise than ξηραν (cf. 1:13 LXX).

Verse 10: האנשים : This plural occurs twice here. In both instances S has the singular ܓܒܪܐ in apposition with a plural verb. This construction is similar to the Hebrew of 1:5.

יראה גדולה : LXX translates in the accusative case: φοβον μεγαν. Aq and Sym change the case to dative, perhaps to indicate means or respect:[1] φοβῳ μεγαλῳ. Similar to them is V with the ablative timore magno.

ברח : The use of a participle indicates the continuance of the action. This idea is preserved in LXX (φευγων) but not in the other versions, which employ the past indicative.

כי הגיד לחם : The hiphil perfect may denote that this action took place before the main verb and thus is to be translated as a pluperfect. In S this entire clause, with a slight modification of the initial word, is attached to the beginning of the following verse, so as to read ܘܟܕ ܚܘܝ ܐܢܘܢ, 'and when (or after) he told them....'

Verse 11: מה־נעשה : G-K explains this construction as the equivalent of a cohortative (165a). Hence, it would carry the meaning of 'what ought we to do...?'

וישתק : This verb appears rarely in OT. Mp indicates only 2 occurrences of this particular form, the second being in v 12 of this chapter. A simple waw consecutive joins this clause to the preceding interrogative (G-K 165a). Although the context would certainly argue that the __waw__ indicates purpose, none of the versions translate it thus. Where one might expect the Greek ινα, there is simply και, similarly V has __et__.

---

[1] See J. Gresham Machen, New Testament Greek, pp. 60, 195.

הולך : Mp states that 3 times the __plene__ form is found in the book of the Twelve (Jon. 1:11,13: Micah 2:7). The verb הלך is frequently used to express continuation of an act. In such cases its form is usually an infinitive absolute rather than a qal participle. Here, however, the participle is employed as a predicate alongside the co-ordinate participle סער (G-K 113u). The entire expression הולך וסער is idiomatic for 'getting rougher and rougher'.[1] As a Hebrew idiom, it is virtually impossible to translate literally. The versions improvise somewhat:

LXX: οτι η θαλασσα επορευετο και εξηγειρεν μαλλον κλυδωνα

'for the sea was going (traveling) and it excited more waves'

Aq and Th are like LXX; Sym uses προσηρχετο instead of επορευετο.

V: __quia__ __mare__ __ibat__ __et__ __intumescebat__ - 'because the sea was going and it was swelling up'

T: ארי ימא אזיל ונחשוליה תקיף

'because the sea was going and its storm was violent'.

S: ܡܛܠ ܕܝܡܐ ܗܘܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܡܬܕܠܚ ܥܠܝܗܘܢ

'for the sea was becoming more and more agitated and it made itself agitated upon them'.

__Verse 12__: ויאמר אליהם : LXX and S supply the name Jonah in this opening clause, and S alone omits the __waw__.

שאוני : This form occurs twice in the OT (Mp); see Job 21:3.

וישתק : See the note on this word in v 11.

בשלי : Another "Aramaising" composite word (cf. the note on בשלמי in v 7), it is the equivalent of the Hebrew למעני.[2] The Masoretes record that the form is an *hapax legomenon*. LXX translates it as δι'εμε (cf. v 7); V as *propter me* (cf. *quare* in v 7); T as בדילי (also in v 7); S as ܡܛܠܬܝ (also in v 7). The arrangement in S is different. ܡܛܠܬܝ introduces a clause which reads: ܗܘ ܗܘܐ ܥܠܝܟܘܢ. The words ܗܘ and ܗܘܐ are not present in the Hebrew text. In S this entire clause is placed at the end of the sentence, *i.e.*, following 'this great storm'.

---

[1] Snaith, __op__. __cit__., p. 19.

[2] Bewer, __op__. __cit__., p. 40.

הסער הגדול הזה עליכם : The versions supply the verb understood here in the Hebrew. All use the verb 'to be', except V which reads *venit*.

Verse 13: ויחתרו : A rare word in Hebrew,[1] this particular form is an *hapax*. The root חתר literally means 'to bore' or 'to dig'. LXX interprets παρεβιαζοντο ('used force'); S employs a general term: ܘܐܬܟܬܫܘ, 'and they endeavored'. V and T specify the kind of force which was used: *remigabant*; שישין, *i.e.*, 'rowing'.

האנשים : Once again S changes this plural into a singular noun in apposition (cf. v 10).

אל־היבשה : Except for LXX, the versions translate היבשה here as they did in v 9. Whereas in 9 LXX read correctly την ξηραν, here it renders the word simply as 'land': προς την γην.[2] Aq does likewise; Sym and Th only change the preposition: εις την γην.

ולא יכלו : This phrase appears 3 times in the OT (Mp); see also Ex. 8:14; II Kgs. 3:26. The verb is a pausal form, the normal being יָכְלוּ. V does not translate this root יכל by *posse*; it interprets: *non valebant*, 'they were not strong'.

וסער : Mp states that this form occurs twice (see 1:11).

---

[1] BDB, p. 369; K-B, p. 345.

[2] See the remarks of J. Ziegler, "Studien zur Verwertung...," *op. cit.*, p. 113.

כי..עליהם: Except for the addition of עליהם, this final clause is identical to that in v 11 and is so rendered in all the versions. LXX, however, has a minor variation in the last section with the omission of κλυδωνα.

Verse 14: ויקראו אל־יהוה: This verb is interpreted as cry in LXX (ανεβοησαν) and in V (clamaverunt). T reads pray (וצליו), followed by its characteristic phrase קדם יי. S retains the Hebrew root קרא.

אָֽנָּה: This interjection is actually composed of two particles, אה and נא.[1] The metheg is indispensable to prevent the pronunciation ŏnnā (G-K 16f). The word is more frequently written with a final א, i.e., אנא; (G-K 16f N). Mp says that only 6 times is it written ה (see Jon. 1:14; 4:2; Ps. 116:4,16; II Kgs. 20:3; and Is. 38:3). Moreover, Kennicott lists a large number of mss where the form אנא appears in Jonah too. The particle, which BDB describes as a strong one of entreaty, is variously rendered by the versions: LXX: the adverb Μηδαμως, 'by no means' or 'not at all'; V: the verb quaesumus, 'we beseech you'; T: the phrase קביל בעותנא, 'listen to our prayer' or 'accept our petition';[2] S: the interjection ܐܘ, 'O!'.

אל־נא: A second particle of entreaty, in this case attached to a negative.[3] It is not retained in LXX, V, or S. T translates it here by כען, as also in v 8, q.v.

בנפש: The preposition ב is variously rendered in the versions, with S being perhaps closest to MT: LXX: εκεκεν της φυχης ; V: in anima; T. בחובת נפשה ; S: ܒܢܦܫܗ.

---

[1] BDB, p. 58. [2] Bewer, op. cit., p. 40.

[3] On נא, see G-K 105a; BDB, p. 609.

ואל־תתן : According to Mp, this phrase occurs 3 times in the OT: see also Dt. 21:8; Joel 2:17.

דם נקיא : The adjectival form נקיא is written with aleph only twice in OT (see Joel 4:18). Many Hebrew mss of Jonah omit this aleph;[1] among them is Mur. 88. The singular דם "is always used when the blood is regarded as an organic unity" (G-K 124n). T interprets: חובת דם זכי , 'the sin of innocent blood'. OL reads sanguinem eius iustum; V simply sanguinem innocentem.

כי־אתה יהוה : In this construction the Divine Name seems to be in apposition to the pronoun. S, however, reads: ܡܛܠ ܕܐܢܬ ܗܘ ܡܪܝܐ, 'for you are he the Lord'. This change necessitates the insertion of a waw at the beginning of the next word (i.e., ܘܐܝܟ = ואיך , 'and according as').

כאשר : The preposition כ is changed into a conjunction here by the addition of the relative אשר ; hence, it means 'according as' (G-K 104b). LXXρ προπον V: sicut; OL: quemadmodum; T: כמא (cf. Hebrew כְּמוֹ); S: ܐܝܟ (cf. Hebrew אֵיךְ).

חפצת עשית : These two qal perfects take several different forms in the versions: LXX: חפצת is translated as the imperfect of βουλομαι: εβουλου , and thus denotes continued action in the past, i.e., 'you were wishing'.[2] עשית is made a perfect: πεποιηκας , 'you have done'. This tense is used in Greek to denote "the present state resultant upon a past action."[3] Jerome makes no distinction in the time-relation of the two verbs. He puts them both in the perfect tense: *voluisti*; *fecisti*. In T the statement is paraphrased so that there is only one verb, and it is a perfect: (ד)רעוא קדמך עבדתא '(to) the pleasure before you, you have done'. S: The two verbs appear here as in Hebrew. To each of them the second person pronoun has been added.

---

[1] Kennicott and de Rossi. [2] Machen, op. cit., #126.

[3] Machen, op. cit., #452.

Verse 15: אל־הים : This preposition is translated εις in LXX; *in* in V: ל in T; and ב in S.

מִזַּעְפּוֹ : A *hapax*. Authorities differ on what part of speech זעף is. The lexicons identify it as a noun masculine plus suffix.[1] Its pointing, however, may be that of an infinitive, as G-K identifies it.[2] The versions are unanimous in translating it as a noun, but this does not necessarily mean that they understood the Hebrew form to be a noun.

Verse 16: וייראו...גדולה : The versions translate here exactly as they do in v 10, with the exception of LXX (cf. below).

את־יהוה : The presence of this word means that the verb וייראו has two objects - the first a cognate or absolute one and this one, a direct object. Perhaps to avoid this awkwardness, LXX turns יראה גדולה into the dative (as Aq and Sym had even done in v 10, though not for the same reason). It reads: και εφοβηθησαν οι ανδρες φοβῳ μεγαλῳ τον κυριον . V is the same. T and S change the accusative to a prepositional phrase: ܕܚܠܬܐ ܪܒܬܐ ܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܡܪܝܐ; דחלא רבא מן קדם יוי '...a great fear from before Yahweh'.

ויזבחו־זבח : OL and V make the object plural: *hostias*, as does one Hebrew mss.[3] T interprets ואמרו לדבחא דיבח , 'and they said (i.e., promised) to sacrifice a sacrifice'. Perhaps T is thinking of the impossibility of actually making a sacrifice on board ship.

---

[1] BDB, p. 277; K-B, p. 263.

[2] Infinitives of the form קְטַל in third guttural verbs "before suffixes sometimes take the form *qaṭl*, as זַעְפּוֹ Jon. 1^{15}" (G-K 61c).

[3] See de Rossi.

ליהוה; Codex א omits this, but elsewhere, both in Greek and Hebrew mss as well as in the versions, it is attested.

וידרו נדרים: The object in S is singular: ܢܕܪܐ. LXX reads και ευξαντο ευχας, 'and they prayed prayers'.

Chapter 2

Verse 1: The root מנה has a number of possible meanings;[1] its piel, as here, means 'appoint' or 'ordain'.[2] Various shades of meaning are evident in the translations: LXX: προσεταξεν - commanded; V: preparavit - prepared; OL: praecepit - commanded, ordered; T: וזמין - assembled, invited, made ready; S: ܘܛܝܒ - prepared, made ready.

דג: The masculine is used as a nomen unitatis, denoting a single example of a class (cf. the note on הדגה in 2:2; G-K 122s). LXX identifies or describes the fish as a 'sea-monster': το κητος.

לבלע: Instead of an infinitive S reads ܘܒܠܥܗ, 'and he swallowed', along with one LXX ms.[3]

שלשה ימים: This particular expression, with a feminine ending on the numeral, occurs 4 times (Mp); see also I Sam. 30:12; I Kgs. 12:5; II Kgs. 2:17. OL omits "three days and...."

Verse 2: הדגה: Only here is the feminine used to denote one fish, i.e., as a nomen unitatis; elsewhere the feminine refers to a class of fish.[4] The form is especially strange, since all other appearances of the word in Jonah are masculine (2:1,11). One explanation is that this is a late usage of the feminine.[1] It is also possible that the final ה has inadvertently crept into the text, perhaps under the influence of the initial ה . However, one may rightly inquire then why this phenomenon did not happen in the other appearances of the word. Further, the suggestion is weakened by the lack of any ms evidence. The feminine form is well attested here, as is the masculine elsewhere.[2]

---

[1] BDB, p. 584. [2] See K-B, p. 537.

[3] See Holmes-Parsons. [4] BDB, p. 185.

Verse 3:[3] מִצָּרָה לִי : The Masora states that with the accent given מצרה here, the form is an hapax. LXX translates the word as if the Hebrew preposition were ב instead of מ: εν θλιφει μου .[4] Perhaps it is noteworthy that rabbinic Bibles call special attention to the ל (of לי) without dagesh, which they claim is the same in all mss (cf., e.g., 4:4,9).[5] The μου by which LXX translates לי is missing in W.

---

[1] Idem.

[2] From the standpoint of textual evidence, then, one cannot accept the unexplained suggestion of K-B (p. 203) that הדגה be read הדג .

[3] For a special study of the Vulgate text of the Psalm in 2:3-10, with particular reference to its apparent reliance upon the translations of Aq, Sym, and Th, see Meinrad Stenzel, "Zum Vulgatatext des Canticum Jonae," Biblica (1952), 356-362. Stenzel points out that the three Greek translations are consistent in their reproduction of foreign words. A given word or phrase, wherever it appears, is most always rendered by the same expression. The Vulgate is also constant. For instance, phrases in the Jonah-Psalm which occur also in the book of Psalms are translated similarly (Jon. 2:3ab = Ps. 18:7a and 120:1ab; Jon. 2:7d = Ps. 30:4a). Often Vulgate readings which do not reflect the MT directly are traceable to one or more of the Hexaplaric translations (cf. סוף 2:6).

[4] The confusion of ב and מ is a common phenomenon. Whether it is due to "similarity of sound or similarity of form" is difficult to determine (Kennedy, Textual Amendment, pp. 14, 44).

[5] See Baer, op. cit. On this construction, see Brockelmann, Hebräische Syntax, p. 74 (#82b).

אל־יהוה : Following this phrase, LXX and OL add 'my God' (τον θεον μου ; *dm̄. meum*). Kennicott cites one ms which reads אדני יהוה. This addition may occur under the influence of the similar phrase in 2:2.

ויענני : T paraphrases וקביל צלותי, 'and he received my prayer'.

מבטן שאול : S places a *waw* at the beginning. T interprets שאול as תהומא, 'ocean'.

שועתי : LXX and OL read this as a noun with suffix rather than as a 1st person verb: κραυγης μου ; *calmoris mei*. This reading rests on a different Hebrew pointing: שַׁוְעָתִי . Apparently all other Greek translations agree with LXX except Sym, who reads: επεκαλεσαμην .

שמעת קולי : T interprets this as עבדתא בעותי , literally, 'you did my wish'. Besides prefacing a *waw* to the phrase S adds the preposition ב to קולי(ܒܩܠܝ). Kennicott 178 supports this reading.

Verse 4: ותשליכני מצולה בלבב ימים : This section contains several difficulties. One would expect the verb, a hiphil imperfect (which, according to Mp, occurs only twice; see Ps. 102:11), to be a perfect with *waw consecutive*. Its present grammatical form connects it with the preceding thought, but the context seems clearly to indicate a break. Perhaps LXX and OL do recognize a pause by omission of the initial *waw*; also they render the verb as aorist (απερριφας) and perfect (*proiecistic*), respectively.

A second problem is occasioned by the noun מצולה , 'deep'.[1] Procksch in BH^3 would delete the word as a gloss which parallels the succeeding phrase, "in the heart of the sea."[2] It is difficult to accept this suggestion. One would have to assume that the text has been deliberately made awkward. In the light of scribal reverence for the preservation of the text, an insertion of this kind seems unlikely.

---

[1] See K-B, p. 556.

[2] Similarly A. R. Johnson deletes it as a gloss upon *nhr* "Jonah II. 3-10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy," *Studies in OT Prophecy*, p. 84).

In this context the noun מצולה would seem to require a preposition and hence ought perhaps to read במצולה . A preposition does occur at the beginning of the next phrase. Since the form בלבב has a plethora of *beths*, it might be conjectured that one of them is misplaced and actually belongs at the beginning of מצולה . If it be the final *beth*, then not only is the construction and wording of the phrase בלבב ימים , unchanged,[1] but also its construction would stand in parallelism to the preceding word, *i.e.*, במצולה בלב ימים ('in the deep, in the heart of the sea'). If the initial *beth* be transferred to מצולה , then the remaining phrase, לבב ימים , may be read as in apposition (*i.e.*, 'in the deep, the heart of the sea'). Neither of these emendations has any support in the Hebrew mss. Yet, without exception, the versions yield readings which seem to presuppose one or the other of them:

LXX: εις βαθη καρδιας θαλασσης

Aq: εν βυβω καρδιας θαλασσων (Note the plural.)

Th: εις αβυσσον εν καρδια θαλασσων

V: *in profundum, in corde maris*

OL: *in altitudem cordis maris* (like LXX)

T: לעומקיא בליבא דימא

S: ܠܥܘܡܩܐ ܒܠܒܗ ܕܝܡܐ

Another possibility is that the Hebrew text as it stands is correct;

---

[1] Both לב and לבב appear in Hebrew; see BDB, pp. 523-24.

no preposition is required for מצולה . The noun may be used with adverbial force, as is sometimes the case in Hebrew (G-K 118c). Thus the present syntax of the sentence is entirely proper and means, 'you cast me deeply into the heart of the sea'.[1] It is also possible that the initial mem is actually a preposition and not a part of the noun. In Isaiah 44:27 the form צולה (minus the mem) occurs with the preposition ל .[2] If this be the case, then the mem here functions as a preposition indicating direction, 'towards the deep' or 'deep-ward'.[3]

ונהר יסבבני : On the parallelism of נהר with the preceding word ימים , cf. Ps. 24:2.[4] Mp says that יסבבני occurs only twice (see 2:6). LXX and OL render this phrase as plural και ποταμοι με εκυκλωσαν; et flumina me circumierunt. T does not employ a verb in translation but rather the noun סחור ('circuit, circumference'), which is often used adverbially;[5] hence, T reads: סחור סחור לי .

משבריך : This word has received different translations in the Greek: LXX: οι μετεωρισμοι σου ; Aq: οι συντριμμοι σου ; Sym: οι γνοφοι σου . T renders it by the phrase נחשולוהי דימא.

Verse 5: ואני אמרתי נגרשתי : Only S interprets the initial waw as contrast: ܕܶܝܢ =Greek δε. The niphal perfect of גרש is a hapax (Mp). The Greek translations employ different verbs and verb forms:

---

[1] One might also conjecture if the ה of מצולה could be a directive suffix. For the parallel phenomenon in Ugaritic, see Gordon, op. cit., 8.50, p. 51. To be sure, this ה is regarded by the lexicons as the feminine singular ending of a noun from the root צול (BDB, p. 846; K-B, p. 556).

[2] See K-B, p. 797. [3] Ibid., p. 535.

[4] See M. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, p. 63f; Johnson, op. cit., p. 84, n 10.

[5] Wright, op. cit., p. 31.

LXX: απωσμαι ; Aq: εξεβην ; Sym and Th: εξεβληθην .

מנגד עיניך : Various Greek translations are worth citing here to show the relationship of the Scroll of the Twelve to the Hexapla:[1] LXX: εξ οφθαλμων σου ; Sym: εξ εναντιας ; GS: [εξ] απεναντι.

אך אוסיף להביט : This idiomatic expression is translated literally in LXX, T, and S. Whereas OL converts the infinitive into an *ut* clause, V deviates from this usual procedure and uses an adverb as a rough equivalent: *rursus videbo*; similarly, Sym with παλιν. The little particle אַך merits comment, since Th apparently reads instead אֵך (= אֵיך), *i.e.*, πως. Sym has ισως; the rest αρα .

אל־היכל קדשך : In V and S this phrase has been made the direct object of the verb *to see*. Codex B has mistakenly recorded λαον (people) instead of ναον. There are some minor variations among the Greek witnesses:[2] LXX: προς τον ναον τον αγιον σου ; GS and Sym:[3] προς ναον αγιον σου .

Verse 6: אפפוני מים עד־נפש : Only LXX and OL change this subject and verb to the singular. No doubt T is giving what it understands the meaning of עד־נפש to be when it paraphrases עד מותא , 'unto death'.

תהום יסבבני : Sym has θαλασσα here rather than αβυσσος , which is found in other Greek witnesses and in the Latin. The Masoretic note for יסבבני reads, "two times and that defective" (cf. 2:4).

---

[1] This list is given in Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, p. 25. LXX and Sym can be verified elsewhere, but, as mentioned earlier, the complete Greek text of the Twelve has not been published.

[2] On the use of αγιος to translate קדש, see H. S. Gehmann, "Ἁγιος in LXX," VT IV (1954), 342.

[3] Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

סוף חבוש לראשי : The word סוּף[1] occasions some difficulty. The Greek recension (GS) is very close to MT: η ελος περιεσχεν την κεφαλην μου.[2] Yet LXX and OL apparently read it as סוֹף (end): εσχατη and *postremo*. They also divide the v differently (see notes on v 7). Sym translates απεραντος (endless). Th translates simply by 'sea': το πελαγος εκαλυφεν την κεφαλην μου.[3] Jerome seems to follow this reading: *pelagus operuit caput meum*. Aq and T thought of the Re(e)d Sea: ερυθρα; ימא דסוף . S renders the Hebrew freely: ܘܥܠܥܠܐ ܕܝܡܐ ܐܬܟܪܟ ܠܪܫܝ. There is no need to assume S was reading a different text.[4]

Verse 7: לקצבי הרים : LXX and OL attach this phrase to the end of the preceding verse. קצב is correctly interpreted as the 'bottom' by T and S and as *extrema* by V. LXX has 'cracks': σχισμας.[5]

---

[1] For a scientific description of these "weeds," see H. N. and A. L. Moldenke, *Plants of the Bible*, p. 249.

[2] Barthélemy observes that when GS strays from LXX it frequently shows extreme literalism which actually violates Greek syntax. Such is not the case here in 2:6, however, with the verb περιεσχ[ε]ν . This reading is found in the Coptic Version of the Twelve. W. Grossouw suggested earlier that the Coptic must have had access to a Hebrew text. Barthélemy argues that it is actually from this newly discovered Greek recension that the Coptic draws its Hebraisms, for this recension is the only Greek witness known today which contains all the readings noted in the Coptic (*Ibid*., pp. 22, 26-27).

[3] Stenzel comments that the exact way in which Aq, Sym, and Th understood the word is something of a mystery but that perhaps the reading of Th is correct. In this case, Jerome followed Th (*op. cit*., p. 361).

[4] See Sebök, *op. cit*., p. 44.

[5] The proposal in BH_3 to read perhaps לקצף נהרים is unnecessary. The meaning of לקצבי הרים is quite correct in terms of Semitic cosmology. Moreover, the second suggestion that this phrase be altered to בקצוי הרים is likewise unnecessary, for the use of the

ירדתי : Unlike LXX and OL, the MT, V, T, and S take this with the preceding phrase.

הארץ ברחיה בעדי לעולם : In keeping with their division of this v, LXX and OL supply a preposition before הארץ, so as to read, 'I descended into the earth'. V renders הארץ as a genitive in relation to ברחיה (*terrae vectes*). The latter word is a *hapax* as it is written (Mp). בעדי לעולם is translated by LXX as κατοχοι αιωνιοι ('everlasting bolts') and likewise by OL as *continentes aeternae*. Some T mss make all of this a separate clause introduced by *waw* (וארעא),[1] and many Hebrew mss attest this reading.[2] Moreover, T adds the phrase בתוקפהא ('with its strength') after *bars*.

ותעל משחת חיי : All the versions connect the noun שחת with a verbal root meaning 'go to ruin', and so they translate it 'corruption' or 'destruction'.[3] Actually the noun is derived from the root /שוח/ 'sink down' and means 'pit'.[4] OL rearranges the order to make שחת the subject: *et ascendat corruptio vitae meae ad te*. After ותעל , T inserts קדמך לאסקא, so as to read, literally, 'and you have brought before you to raise up from destruction my life'.

Verse 8: According to Ginsburg, one ms (Arundel Oriental 16) cites this as the middle verse in *Jonah*.[5]

בהתעטף עלי נפשי : Mp indicates that בהתעטף occurs twice (see Ps. 142:4). A few mss read רוחי instead of נפשי .[6]

---

noun קצב to mean 'extremity', while only here in OT, is paralleled in Ecclus. 16:19. See BDB, p. 891; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[1] See Sperber, *op. cit.*, p. 437. [2] See Kennicott and de Rossi.

[3] See BDB, p. 1007. [4] BDB, p. 1001.

[5] Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, p. 96. [6] See Kennicott and de Rossi.

את־יהוה זכרתי : T paraphrases: פולחנא דיוי אידכרית , 'the worship of Yahweh I remembered'.

ותבוא : It is written plene 10 times in the prophetic books (Mp); see also Jud. 4:21; I Sam. 28:21; II Sam. 11:4; 20:22; II Kgs. 11:16; Ez. 33:4,6; 37:10. A number of the versions read this imperfect waw consecutive as though it were future - e.g., V: ut veniat....

אל־היכל קדשך : S places the pronominal suffix on הכל rather than on קדש.

Verse 9: הבלי־שוא : A construct phrase occurring twice in OT (Mp: see Deut. 32;21). It is rendered by two direct objects in LXX (ματαια και ψευδη) and in OL (vana et falsa); by ματαιοτητα in Aq and by ατμους ματαιους in Sym. V reads vanitates frustra.

חסדם יעזבו : LXX and OL translate this qal imperfect in the past tense (εγκατελιπον and dereliquerunt). The word חסד seems to present some difficulty. While the Greek and Latin translate as the Hebrew stands, apparently T found the meaning unclear and thus paraphrased the entire v: לא כעממיא פלחי טעותא דמאתר דאתוטב להון
לית אנון ידעין:

S also recognizes a problem here, but its solution is simply to change the suffix from third to second person, thereby referring to Yahweh: ܛܝܒܘܬܟ , 'thy lovingkindness'.

Verse 10: תודה LXX and OL have a double translation for this term: αινεσεως και εξομολγησεως ; laudis et confessionis. Origen indicates that και εξομολγησεως is to be excised.

אשלמה : This form occurs twice in the OT (Mp); see Prov. 20:22.

ישועתה ליהוה : MT separates these two words from the preceding. Most of the versions, however, tie them to the verb אשלמה : e.g., V: reddam pro salute Domino; also cf. S. T seems to make this connection too, but beyond that it paraphrases: פורקן נפשי בצלו קדם יוי , 'deliverance of my life in prayer before Yahweh'.

The form ישועתה occurs only 3 times in OT (Ps. 3:3; 80:3).[1] J. Kennedy suggests that it may be an error resulting from the fusion of ישועה עתה.[2] Gesenius observes that the ending תה_ is often found on feminine nouns in poetic contexts (see G-K 90g for examples). The final ה may function here as does the ה directive in Ugaritic.[3]

The *samekh* at the end of this verse (ס) is a Masoretic note for סתומא or a closed paragraph, just as פ (= פתוחא) indicates an open paragraph.[4]

Verse 11: ויאמר יהוה : Some Septuagintal mss omit the divine name and put the verb in the passive: και προσεταγη (OL: *praeceptum est*). Other mss read, with the Hebrew, και προσεταξε κυριος ; Aq and Th: και ειπε κυριος ; Sym: ειπε δε.... The understanding of the verb אמר as 'command' is found also in S: ܘܦܩܕ .[5] T and V translate literally, 'say': (אמר : *dixit*).

לדג : See the relevant remarks in 2:1,2. In his LXX column Origen inserts the words απο κυριου after לדג, indicating that they were present in the original text along with the passive verb.

ויקא : An *hapax* (Mp); differences in its renderings in the Greek witnesses include: LXX: και εξεβαλεν ; Aq: και εξεμεσε ; Sym: ινα απεμεση .

---

[1] BDB, p. 447. In this case the Masoretic note calling this word an *hapax* does not apply to the entire OT.

[2] Kennedy, *Textual Amendment*, p. 165f.

[3] See Gordon, *op*. *cit*., p. 88.

[4] For an explanation of these marks, see Ginsburg, *op*. *cit*., p. 10 and Würthwein, *op*. *cit*., p. 16.

[5] Cf. Arabic '^{a}mara; see T. H. Robinson, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, HAT, p. 122.

MT marks an open paragraph (פ) at the conclusion of this verse.

Chapter 3

Verse 1: See the relevant comments made on 1:1. The word שנית is translated as 'second time' by all witnesses except OL, which simply says *iterum*.

קום...אליה : See the relevant remarks in 1:2. The prepositions על and אל are used interchangeably in Hebrew.[1]

את־הקריאה אשר אנכי דבר אליך : As Mp notes, הקריאה is an *hapax*, found only here in the entire OT. Greek translates it as κηρυγμα ;[2] Latin as *praedicationem*; T as נבואתא . As MT reads, notably with the participle דבר , it is an open question whether this proclamation is the same as 1:2 or something new.[3] LXX interprets explicitly by the addition of an adverb and the use of an aorist: το κηρυγμα το εμπροσθεν ο εγω ελαλησα προς σε . Likewise, OL explains: *secundum praedicationem priorem: quam ego palam locutus sum ad te*. These readings may be attempts to clarify the vagueness of MT; there is no convincing reason to conjecture that they are preserving a different or more reliable text. To the contrary, Origen indicates το εμπροσθεν is to be excised. Certainly MT does not imply a difference in the two commands.[4]

---

[1] "על and אל are frequently confused and later on meant almost the same, esp. to the copyists" (Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 31).

[2] A few LXX mss read ρημα (Holmes-Parsons).

[3] Cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 122. His conclusion that LXX preserves the original text is not necessarily correct.

[4] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 53

Verse 3: כדבר יהוה : Instead of using κατα (= כ) plus the noun, LXX turns this phrase into a clause with subject and predicate: καθως ελαλησεν κυριος . OL is similar: *sicut locutus est ad eum dm̄s*. The other versions follow MT.

היתה : All Hebrew mss attest the presence of this perfect in the text, and the versions follow suit.

עיר־גדולה לאלהים : A Hebrew idiom preserved literally by all the witnesses except V, which merely reads *civitas magna*, omitting *deo*.

A word is in order about the use and meaning of this idiom. The divine name is sometimes employed in Hebrew as an epithet with superlative force (cf. Gen. 23:6; 30:8; I Sam. 14:15; Ps. 36:7, etc.).[1] Since this idiom is not the usual way of expressing the superlative, one must inquire further as to its particular significance. It is inadequate to say as did Ehrlich,[2] that the use of *Elohim* in Jon. 3:3 has no special importance beyond intensifying the adjective *great*. The fact that the story-teller chose to describe the greatness of the city in relation to God clearly gives a religious connotation to the phrase. The author may be saying that Nineveh is great by virtue of divine favor; it is God who has ordained her greatness. More likely he is saying that Nineveh is very great in the sight of God.[3] It is not merely a great city from a human perspective; it has a superhuman greatness, even in the estimation of God himself.[4]

---

[1] D. W. Thomas, "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew," VT III (1953), 209-224.

[2] A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebr. Bibel V*, p. 269.

[3] See E. G. H. Kraeling, "The Origin and Real Name of Nimrod," AJSLL 38 (Oct. 1921 - July, 1922), 217; see also J. Pidge, *Jonah*, p. 25.

[4] See K-B , p. 51b.

It is interesting that Yahweh repeatedly calls Nineveh "the great city" (1:2; 3:2; 4:11). Further, the idiom in 3:3 may suggest that the city is so very great it could qualify as a divine residence. Nineveh is fit for God. Thus, to interpret the phrase "city great to God" as simply a superlative expression is to miss its extraordinary meanings. Surely human measurements of greatness fall by the wayside when divine standards appear. And by divine standards Nineveh is an exceedingly great city.

Verse 4: Mp comments on 4 words or phrases: ויחל - occurs 9 times (e.g., Gen. 9:20; Nu. 25:1; Jud. 16:22; II Chron. 3:1,2); יום אחד - occurs 4 times (I Sam. 9:15; 27:1; Is. 9:13); ויקרא ויאמר - occurs 10 times; ונינוה נהפכת - an *hapax legomenon*.

ארבעים : This reading is supported by Aq., Sym, and Th (τεσσαρακοντα); also by V, T, and S. But LXX (and OL) reads τρεις.[1] It may be impossible to determine finally which reading is the original and which the substitution.[2] The numeral 40 seems to have special significance in the OT, sometimes to designate periods of trial or waiting (e.g., Gen. 7:4; Ex. 16:35; 24:8; Dt. 9:9,18; Num. 14:33; Jud. 13:1; Ps. 95:10, *etc*.).

נהפכת : On the use of this participle, cf. Hag. 2:6.[3]

Verse 5: ויאמינו...באלהים : T interprets this statement as believing "in the word of Yahweh" (במימרא דיוי). Cf. Gen. 15:6.

מגדולם ועד־קטנם : A characteristic way of expressing the superlative in Hebrew,[4] this phrase is translated literally in the versions: e.g., LXX: απο μεγαλου αυτων εως μικρου αυτων.

---

[1] de Rossi lists one Hebrew ms (663) which reads שלשים.

[2] Cf. Feuillet, "Le Livre de Jonas," p. 31.

[3] S. R. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 153f.

[4] See Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax*, p. 59.

Verse 6: מכסאו...אדרתו : T adds a modifying noun to each of these words: מכורסי מלכותיה , 'from the throne of his sovereignty'; לבושי יקריה , 'the robe of his honor'. Instead of robe, S reads crown (ܬܓܗ). Sebök wonders if S might have read הדרתו instead of אדרתו and then have given ܬܓܗ as a free translation of it?[1] The change is theoretically possible, since א and ה were sometimes interchanged in Hebrew script.[2] Yet the suggestion is weakened by the fact that it assumes for the Peshitta a free translation of a word which itself is not attested in any Hebrew mss.

ויעבר : According to Mp, this form is found 9 times; see also Gen. 8:1; 32:24; I Sam. 16:9,10; I Kgs. 15:12; Ezr. 1:1; II Chron. 15:8; 36:22.

האפר : The article attached to this noun is actually another way of indicating the plural in Hebrew; it denotes the sum total of a class of things(see G-K 126m). All the versions translate by the plural ashes.

Verse 7: ויזעק ויאמר : The hiphil form ויזעק appears 4 times in OT (Mp); see also Jud. 4:10,13; Zach. 6:8. OL has only one verb for these two and that is a passive: et praedicatum est. S has both verbs but in the plural rather than in the singular.

מטעם : OL omits טעם altogether and merely retains the preposition מ as a. LXX either omits it or reads it perhaps as מעם , so as to translate παρα . Sym follows the Hebrew (απο του δογματος...), as do the remaining versions.

וגדליו : OL explains this as the "great ones of his state": a maioribus civitatis eius.

---

[1] Sebök, op. cit., p. 45.

[2] See Kennedy, Textual Amendment, p. 12.

לאמר : S alone among the versions omits this; one Kennicott ms does likewise.

הבקר : LXX, OL, V, and S connect this to the preceding vocative by the insertion of waw; one Hebrew ms attests the same reading.

Verse 8: The three verbs here are imperfect waw consecutives. According to Mp, the form ויתכסו is a hapax and the form וישבו appears only 8 times. These imperfects have jussive force, a fact not recognized by LXX and OL, which read them as past tenses (e.g., περιεβαλοντο ; cooperuerunt). Other Greek witnesses do likewise. The root שוב Aq and Th translate by the verb στεφω rather than by αποστρεφω as does the LXX.

אל־אלהים : Mur. 88 varies slightly from the MT by using the preposition על. As already pointed out, the two prepositions are interchangeable.

בחזקה : This construction is found 4 times in OT (Mp); see also Jud. 4:3; 8:1; I Sam. 2:16. LXX and OL interpret it as an adverb: εκτενως ; vehementer. Aq, Sym, and Th read εν ισχυι . V reads in fortitudine, T בתקוף , and S ܒܐܢ̈ܚܬܐ 'with groans'.[1]

וישבו : This form appears 8 times in the OT (Mp); see also Ex. 14:2,26; Jer. 26:3; 36:7; Ps. 22:28; 59:15; II Chron. 7:14.

Since LXX and OL misread the verbs as narrative descriptions of of past events rather than as parts of the royal decree, they have necessarily to add a word at the end of this verse to introduce the interrogative which follows in v 9: λεγοντες; et dixerunt.

---

[1] Sebök would account for this Syriac reading in one of two ways: "-זק- in בחזקה war vielleicht in ihrer Vorlage unleserlich; sie ergänzte nun das übrig gebliebene בחה zu באנחה , oder verstand vielleicht unter בחזקה einen lauten Wehruf und übersetzte demnach Wehruf." The first proposal seems somewhat forced. It is more likely that the phrase 'with groans' is an interpretation of the Hebrew בחזקה .

Verse 9: ישוב ונחם : One of these verbs is omitted by LXX and OL. Origen claims it is the second (נחם), which Aq, Sym, and Th translate as παρακληθησεται . The first (ישוב), he says, is present in LXX as μετανοησει and in the others as επιστρεφει . The opposite, however, is probably the correct understanding of LXX, i.e., that it omits the verb שוב rather than נחם . In other cases in Jonah where LXX is without a doubt translating the root שוב (as ושב of 3:9 and שבו of 3:10), it uses the verb αποστρεφω (never μετὰνοεω). Conversely, where it is very definitely translating the root נחם, (as וינחם in 3:10, and ונחם in 4:2, it uses μετανοεω . These respective translations would no doubt apply here, in which case Origen is mistaken. It is ישוב which is omitted; נחם is rendered by μετανοησει .[1] One can see how LXX might easily omit ישוב as repetitious in context.[2]

Mp says that the 6 occurrences of ונחם (including the whole of Isaiah) are always written in this way; see Joel 2:14; Ex. 32:31. Both T and S employ here the root רחם , 'to have pity'. The switch from נחם to רחם is understandable.[3]

מחרון אפו : Greek and Latin convert this anthropomorphism into more abstract language: LXX: εξ οργης θυμου αυτου ; OL: iram

---

[1] Hatch and Redpath support this conclusion. They record that all occurrences of the verb μετανοειν in Jonah are translations of נחם . (A Concordance to the Septuagint, II, p. 916).

[2] Holmes-Parsons gives about 9 mss which, like the Hebrew, have two verbs: μετανοησει και παροκληθησεται.

[3] See Kennedy, Textual Amendment, p. 100f.

furoris sui (direct object of the verb *avertit*); V: *a furore irae suae*.

Verse 10: כי־שבו : While LXX accurately translates οτι αποστρεφαν , Aq, Sym, and Th insert εκαστος . This addition has no basis in the Hebrew mss.

וינחם : As in v 9, Aq, Sym, and Th translate this not by the μετανοεω of LXX but as και παρεκληθη . What remains of the word in GS suggests that it is in agreement with Aq *et al*:]ληθηι.[1]

The clause beginning with וינחם and ending with לעשות־להם is rendered freely by S, the translation corresponding to a section of v 9: ܘܐܗܦܟ ܠܘܬܗܘܢ ܡܢ ܚܡܬܐ ܕܪܘܓܙܗ , 'and he repented from the passion of his anger'.

The Masoretes comment on two parts of the v: וינחם האלהים - *hapax*; ולא עשה - occurs 5 times (see II Sam. 19:25; II Kgs. 16:2; II Chron. 28:1).

Chapter 4

Verse 1: ויחר לו : Whereas the majority of Greek witnesses translate this verb by συνεχυθη Sym and GS read ηθεμησεν.[2] To these words S adds ܛܒ as an adverb signifying 'very' or 'excessively'.

Verse 2: אנה : The rendering of this particle here is the same as in 1:14 for T and S. LXX changes, with some mss omitting it entirely, others reading ω and still others ω δη. OL omits it; V has *obsecro*.

---

[1] For a discussion of the possible relationships between Aq and GS, see Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-25. See also Vogt, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

[2] Although the letter θ is missing from the text of GS, the identity of the entire form with that in Sym is certain. This reading is found also in the Coptic Twelve (Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, p. 262).

דברי : This singular noun with 1st person pronominal suffix is found 13 times in OT (Mp); see, e.g., Nu. 11:23; II Sam. 19:44; I Kgs. 6:12; 17:1; Is. 55:11; 66:2; Jer. 1:12; 23:28,29; 29:10; Job 29:22. Both LXX and OL make it plural: οι λογοι μου ; verba mea.

עַד־הֱיוֹתִי : It has been suggested that this particle ought to be repointed to read וְעוֹד [1] or בעוֹד .[2] In support of this change the LXX is cited: ετι οντος μου . Yet the reading of MT may also be defended (עַד= 'as long as').[3]

על־אדמתי : This phrase occurs 3 times (Mp); see also II Chron. 7:20; Job 31:38.

קדמתי לברח : Found twice in OT. (Mp; see Ps. 119:147), קדמתי does not actually contain the principal idea of the statement but rather "only a subordinate adverbial statement"; the main idea is given in the infinitive (G-K 114 nN; 120).[4] Thus the statement may be translated: 'I fled before'. On the other hand, Bewer proposes a possibility in which קדמתי has the full force of a verb: 'I sought to prevent', or 'forestall (it) by fleeing'.[5] It would appear that none of the versions explicitly understand קדמתי to be used adverbially; at least they follow the Hebrew closely in translating it as the governing verb: e.g., LXX: προσεφθασα του φυγειν ; V: praeoccupavi ut fugerem.

אל : LXX (and OL) omits this Divine Name, simply reading 'you are', followed by predicate adjectives.

---

[1] G. R. Driver, "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs," JTS 41 (1940), 172; Procksch, BH$_3$.

[2] Bewer, op. cit., p. 59. [3] K-B, p. 680b.

[4] See T. H. Robinson, op. cit., p. 124.

[5] Bewer, op. cit., p. 59.

נחם...הרעה : LXX translates נחם by μετανοων[1] while Sym retains the verb παρακαλουμενος. Likewise, LXX (and OL) makes הרעה plural (same change as with דברי above), while Sym keeps the singular of the Hebrew.

Verse 3: יהוה : LXX has a double vocative: δεσποτα κυριε ; OL also: *dominator dñe*. These readings would seem to presuppose an אדני in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, but no mss bear witness to it. They may be a deliberate addition for emphasis. According to Origen, the repetition of κυριε κυριε in some Greek mss ought to be eliminated.

נא : The translation of Hebrew particles varies even within one version. Whereas V did not translate נא in 1:8, here it reads *quaeso*, the same word which it uses for אנא in 4:2. T again reads כען . LXX, OL, and S omit it altogether, as do two Hebrew mss.[2]

כי...מחיי : On the expression of the comparative in Hebrew, see G-K 133. V and T translate this phrase literally, *mutatis mutandis*. LXX, OL, and S, however, convert the nouns חי and מות into infinitives, *i.e.*, 'for it is better for me to die than to live'.

At the conclusion of this verse MT indicates another closed paragraph (ס); cf. 2:10.

Verse 4: One Hebrew ms[3] and S insert אליו. LXX, along with OL and Arabic, adds προς Ιωναν , which the Hexapla excises.[4]

---

[1] Throughout *Jonah*, the LXX translates this anthropopathism literally; cf. J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, p. 252f. On Jerome's translations of *nḥm* by the verbs *ignoscere* (3:9; 4:2) and *misereri* (3:10) rather than by *poenitet*, see R. Loewe, "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism," VT 2 (1952), esp. 269f.

[2] See Kennicott.

[3] See de Rossi.

[4] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 251.

ההיטב חרה לך: This Hiph'il infinitive absolute (ההיטב) functions as an adverb (G-K 113k). According to Mp, this form with the ה interrogative appears only twice; see Jon. 4:9. The Hebrew may be translated in two ways: (1) Do you well to be angry? (Is anger good for you?) (2) Are you very angry? The Greek accepts the second possibility; the other versions the first: LXX: Ει οφοδρα λελυπησαι συ ;(OL: *si valde contristatus es tu*?); V: *Putasne bene irasceris tu*?; S: ܛܒ ܟܪܝܬ ܠܟ ; T: הלחדא תקוף לך . Other Greek translations differ chiefly in the particular adverb used: Sym: αρα δικαιως ελυπηθης ; Aq and Th: ει καλως ελυπηθης .

Ziegler records that SypArab include here an answer to the question asked: *dixit* (+ *ionas* Syp) *valde contristatus sum ego usque ad mortem*.[1] This reply has no doubt crept into the translations under the influence of 4:9.

מקדם

Verse 5: LXX reads απεναντι ; OL: *contra*. Whether this translation is an interpretation of the entire word or only of the preposition מ , with קדם omitted, is difficult to discern. V translates *contra Orientem*.

סכה OL seems closer to MT here than does V. It translates *booth* by *tabernaculum*. Jerome's use of *umbraculum* is faithful to the general meaning but is not literal.

בצל : According to the Hexapla, this prepositional phrase is omitted by LXX. Yet it appears in Codices א, B, A, and Q; thus it is well attested.[2]

---

[1] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 251.

[2] Bewer notes that the omission of this word continues to be mistakenly asserted, perhaps on Wellhausen's authority (*op. cit.*, p. 59). No doubt Wellhausen was relying upon Origen.

מה־יהיה בעיר : T inserts בסוף before the last word, which may be an effort to interpret or clarify the meaning of the clause, i.e., Jonah waited to see what would happen finally ('at the end') in the city.

Verse 6: יהוה־אלהים : No doubt the Masoretes were indicating the unusualness of this combination when they observed that it is present 5 times in the prophetic books. See also II Sam. 7:22,25; II Kgs. 19:19; possibly Jer. 10:10. Kennicott has catalogued one ms which omits אלהים and 5 which have the variant doublet אדני־יהוה . All the versions follow MT.[1]

קיקיון : The Masoretes fail to point out that the appearances of this word in OT are limited exclusively to Jon. 4. That the versions were uncertain of the meaning of the term is evident in their translations. LXX calls it 'bottle-gourd' (κολοκυνθη), an identification copied no doubt by OL (cucurbita) i.e., 'pumpkin', and by S ܠܩܪܘܕܐ ܒܩܪܐ. Jerome did not accept this rendering; he believed the Hebrew to be the equivalent of (h)edera (ivy).[2] In this he was supported by Sym, which has the corresponding Greek κισσον Aq and Th have κικεωνα . Finally, T is exactly as MT: קיקיון . At best the translations appear to be guessing; they do not illuminate the meaning of the Hebrew text.[3]

ויעל | מעל ליונה : A noteline (cf. 1:3) is inserted here between adjacent words whose letters are similar. Its function, maintains Kennedy, is "to assure the reader that both are genuine elements in the text."[1] On their translations of the phrase ומעל ליונה, the LXX, OL, and V are in agreement contra the literal rendering of MT, which is found in T and S. These three paraphrase slightly: υπερ κεφαλης του Ιωνα ;[2] super caput Jonae.

---

[1] Ziegler cites a few Greek translations which omit either κυριος (Arm) or ο θεος(AchSaAeth) (Septuaginta, p. 251).

[2] For not following the Greek in translating this particular word, Jerome was attacked by Augustine, who claimed that the "new" translation 'ivy' caused great difficulty. See Epistle LXXXI in Migne, Patrologia Latina, Vol. 33, Part 2, p. 275.

[3] "The identification of kikayon with the bottle gourd by LXX S L has has no philological justification and seems to have been guessed by LXX as

לְהַצִּיל : As pointed in MT, this hiphil infinitive construct is from the root /נצל/, 'to deliver'. LXX reads, however, του σκιαζειν , (to shelter), which presupposes a different pointing: לְהָצִיל (root: /צלל/). OL, S, and V follow LXX here. The infinitive in T is לאגנא , 'to reveal, uncover', which may be a paraphrase of MT. Since the consonantal text can be read either way and since either interpretation is legitimate in context, the original reading can hardly be ascertained.

Although the preposition ל(ו) may be an error of dittography based on the final lamedh of the preceding infinitive, the text is not incorrect as it stands. The "extra" lamedh may be intentional (see the relevant comments in Chapter III ad loc.). LXX, S, and T translate the form either with a preposition or as an indirect object. V and OL have the direct object eum.

The noun רעת is plural in LXX and OL. V does not have it at all; instead it reads laboraverat enim - a puzzling clause which is difficult to account for.

---

being the most probable plant in connection with a hut....the identification has...no more foundation than that with ivy (Sym V)" (Bewer, op. cit., p. 61). On the probable identity of the word with the castor-bean, see Moldenke, op. cit., p. 203f.

[1] Kennedy, Textual Amendment, p. 41. Cf. Psalms 40:18; 70:6; 18:8; Deut. 1:28; Jer. 6:11.

[2] Ziegler does point out two Greek translations (AchSa) which omit κεφαλης .

Verse 7: וימן האלהים : This combination is an hapax in OT (Mp). Some confusion exists in the versions about the Divine Name; S and a few Greek witnesses[1] add κυριος a combination which is found in the Hebrew of v 6.

בעלות השחר : LXX renders this phrase freely: εωθινη τη επαυριον. Only 5 times in OT does בעלות occur (Mp); see also Jud. 13:20; I Kgs. 11:15; 18:36; Jer. 35:11. Kennicott and de Rossi cite many mss which read instead כעלות.

Two final notes are provided by Mp: למחרת - hapax; וייבש - occurs 3 times (I Kgs. 17:7 +).

למחרת : S translates this by two words: ܘܠܝܘܡܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ ; and it places them at the beginning of the v. Sebök suggests that in this position the phrase is to be read adverbially.[2]

Verse 8: ויהי | כזרח : A third paseq in Jonah, this one may be used to call attention to the pleonasm ויהי.[3] This introductory formula is omitted by V and S.

כזרח is found twice in OT (Mp); see Jud. 9:33.

אלהים : S and a few Greek mss[4] add κυριος .

חרישית : The Masoretes indicate the difficulty of this word when they note that it is an hapax. Its root and its meaning are most uncertain. LXX, OL, and S translate it 'burning' or 'scorching' (καυσωνος).

---

[1] Ziegler, Septuaginta, p. 252.

[2] "Sie fasst es adverbial des folgenden Tages", nicht etwa zu verbinden וימן למחרת : und er bestimmte für den folgenden Tag".... Sebök, op. cit., p. 45.

[3] Kennedy, Noteline, pp. 44, 50f.

[4] Ziegler, Septuaginta, p. 252.

Similarly V reads *vento calido, et urenti*. T reads שתיקתא ('quiet' = sultry?).

Several roots have been suggested. Apparently T thought of חרש, 'be silent'. Siegfried and Städe[1] suggested חרש 'cut', 'plough'. Hitzig[2] used the same root and understood the term 'ploughing' to mean 'the time of ploughing'; hence, an "autumnal wind." Kohler[3] proposed the root חרס (sun = 'hot wind'). This same root was cited also by Steiner[4] who emended the text to read חריסית ('hot'). Other emendations include: בשחר (in the morning);[5] חרחרת (root חרר; 'scorching'; cf. Dt. 28:22);[6] חרירית (root חרר; 'glowing');[7] מחכבת ('scorching');[8] חריפית (root חרף; 'sharp');[9] משחית or מחיב.[10]

Quite obviously the word חרישית is an enigma.[11] Efforts to emend it carry little weight. The fact that the present form has appeared in a hymn from Qumran may be a sign of its genuineness.[12] At least the form is attested outside Jonah, even though its meaning remains obscure.[1] Weiser's policy of not attempting to translate it is perhaps wise.[2]

---

[1] Carl Siegfried and B. Städe, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*, pp. 224, 227.

[2] F. Hitzig, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, p. 171.

[3] K. Kohler, "The Original Form of the Book of Jonah," TR 16 (Jan. 1879), 143.

[4] H. Steiner, *Kleinen Propheten*, pp. 184-85.

[5] T. K. Cheyne, "Jonah," *EB*, col. 2566.

[6] H. Graetz, *Emendationes* II, p. 18.

[7] W. Böhme, "Die Composition des Buches Jona," ZAW 7 (1887), pp. 255-56; J. Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, IV, p. 211.

[8] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 62. [9] K-B, p. 333b. [10] Procksch in BH_3.

[11] For additional attempts to translate it, see J. Bachmann, "Jona and Haggai," *op. cit.*, p. 17; M. Kalisch, *The Book of Jonah*, p. 303.

[12] E. L. Sukenik, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*, Plate 41, Col. 7, line 5.

ויתעלף : From the root /עלף/, 'cover', this hithpael form is a hapax (Mp). It is variously translated by the versions and others: LXX: και ωλιγοφυχησεν ; Aq: και απεσκαριζε ; Sym and Th: και εξελυθη (παρελυθη); V: et aestuabat ('and he was hot'); S: ܘܐܬܟܪܝ ('and he was vexed' or 'struck').

וישאל...למות : LXX translates this clause freely: και απελεγετο την φυχην αυτου.

טוב...מחיי : LXX, OL, and T handle this phrase as in 4:3, whereas V switches here to infinitives (similar to OL). S does not really translate; instead it uses words attributed to Elijah in I Kings 19:4:

ܘܐܡܪ ܡܠܠܐ ܒܐܪܝܐ ܡܪܝܐ ܠܡܫܩܠ ܢܦܫܝ ܡܢܝ ܡܛܠ
ܕܠܐ ܗܘܝܬ ܛܒ ܐܢ ܡܢ ܐܒܗܝ.

Verse 9: ויאמר אלהים : According to Mp, this clause appears 25 times in the OT (e.g., Gen. 1:3,6,9,11,14,20,24,26,29). S and a few Greek mss continue to add κυριος to the Divine Name.

ההיטב חרה־לך : Cf. comments on 4:3.

ויאמר...מות : S inserts the name Jonah. For the rendering of this Hebrew idiom in the versions, see the relevant comments in 4:3, mutatis mutandis. Mur. 88 writes היטב here in plene form: היטיב . It has been suggested that the phrase עד־מות is to be taken as a colloquial expression for the superlative.[3] Thereby Jonah is saying that he is exceedingly angry. It would seem, however, that in this context the phrase ought to be understood literally. As stated explicitly in 4:3, Jonah does wish to die; to him death is preferable to life. Consequently his statement here in 4:9 carries heavier meaning than the superlative "very" or "exceedingly angry." It is again the expression of a death-wish. Jonah is literally angry enough to die.

---

[1] See T. H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures, pp. 159, 216.

[2] Weiser, ATD, p. 224. Cf. also P.H. Grangaard, Propheten Jona, p. 25.

[3] See Thomas, "Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative," op. cit.,

ויאמר יהוה : S inserts 'to him'.

אשר לא־עמלת בו : With the exception of V, all the versions translate this clause *verbatim*, thereby entailing a certain redundancy: e.g., LXX: υπερ ης ουκ εκακοπαθησας επ' αυτην . V avoids this awkwardness occasioned by the relative אשר and the preposition בו by the one phrase *in qua*.

ולא גדלתו : V deviates from the other versions which render this verb by a corresponding one; it presents the meaning in a clause: *neque fecisti ut cresceret*. The Hebrew verb form is a *hapax* (Mp).

שבן־לילה...ובן לילה : Each of these phrases is a *hapax*. ש here is the relative pronoun used instead of אשר (cf. 1:7 and G-K 36). The pointing of the construct בִּן־ (instead of בֶּן־) is rare (G-K 96). Further, the use of this particular word here is idiomatic - "used poetically of things without life" (G-K 128v). Only S and a few Greek witnesses[1] translate it literally, 'son of the night'. With minor variations, the major versions all read simply, 'which came up in' (or 'over') one night and perished in one night'. Moreover, Kennicott and de Rossi list over 50 mss where the Hebrew reading is also a preposition rather than the noun *son*:

---

pp. 219f; T. E. Bird, *The Book of Jona*, p. 18; M. Delcor, "Jonas," *La Sainte Bible*, p. 292.

[1] Ziegler, *Septuaginta*, p. 252.

שבין ; or simply with waw rather than with the relative: ובין. One can readily see how this change might occur in the Hebrew.

Verse 11: All the versions rightly understand this sentence to be an interrogative, although the Hebrew indicates it in no special way.[1] There is no need to argue, as does Nötscher,[2] that lōʾ is a covering here for an emphatic lū or lā. The negative fits the context without difficulty.

יש־בה : While other versions render the substantive יש by the verb 'to be', LXX has a different reading: κατοικουσιν. Put back into Hebrew this verb would be ישבו . One can easily see the close connection between it and the phrase in MT. Most likely it is a mistake rather than a deliberate change or the sign of a different Hebrew text.

רבו אדם : According to Mp, רבו is written defective 4 times; see also I Chr. 29:7,7; Hos. 8:12(Kethib). de Rossi finds many Jonah mss which read plene רבוא. אדם never occurs in the plural; it is used collectively (cf. 1:6; 3:4).

לא־ידע : To ουκ εγνωσαν Aq, Sym, and Th add the infinitive διακρινειν ('to differentiate').

D. Conclusions

On the basis of this examination of Jonah, certain conclusions suggest themselves regarding the state of the Hebrew text and of that text as witnessed to by the versions.

First of all, the aim to discover an authentic Hebrew text needs elucidation, for the term 'Masoretic Text' is everywhere used in Textual

---

[1] "A question need not necessarily be introduced by a special interrogative pronoun or adverb. Frequently the natural emphasis upon the words is of itself sufficient to indicate an interrogative sentence as such" (G-K 150a).

[2] F. Nötscher, "Zum Emphatischen Lamed," VT III (1953), 374f.

Criticism but not everywhere understood. In relevant ancient literature no references are made to *one official* Hebrew text from which all others are derived.[1] Thus, any search to find the one and only text is a false pursuit; strictly speaking, there is no such phenomenon as *the* MT. What one hopes to establish is rather *a type of MT* to which the mss hopefully point, *i.e.*, the *Textus Receptus*. It is in this sense only that the convenient term MT must be employed.

Paul Lagarde brought to culmination a trend in Hebrew textual studies with his theory of the archetype, in which he categorically declared

> that the Jews had, from the early part of the second century A.D., a standard, authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible, based on a single manuscript, and that this text was thereafter transmitted with scrupulous exactness, even to the reproduction of errors, and is the text to which all our manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible go back....[2]

Recent opposition to this theory has come from Paul Kahle and his followers, who maintain that the ancient schools of ben Asher and of ben Naphtali were not only independent but differed considerably in the consonantal texts which they preserved and in their vocalizing of these texts.[3] If Lagarde overstated his case, as is generally conceded,[4] the same can be said for Kahle. The first scholar exaggerated uniformity, and the latter exaggerated diversity. Yet the scholarly consensus today seems not to lie in a mid-point between these two extremes; rather it is somewhat closer to the view of Lagarde in affirming that about the second century B.C., an attempt was made to standardize the Hebrew Text, even though a definite archetype did not come into existence before the Middle Ages.[1]

---

[1] This brief discussion of the use and meaning of the term 'MT' is drawn from the lectures by H. M. Orlinsky. These lectures were delivered at Union Theological Seminary, New York, in the spring of 1960.

[2] Thomas, "Textual Criticism," *op. cit.*, p. 243f.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 244f.

[4] *Idem.*; Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 126; Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 24f.

When Jonah is analyzed in light of these prevailing views, the results fall in line with what has been generally claimed. The mss catalogued by Kennicott, de Rossi, etc. agree to a considerable extent with each other and with the text of BH_3. Of course, literally hundreds of variants are listed, but the vast majority of them have to do simply with the absence and presence of matres lectionis which affect the text not at all.[2] Examples were listed in the opening vs of Jonah: אמתי and אמיתי (1:1); נינוה and נגוה ; הגדולה and הגדלה (1:2). To pursue the study of such variants would be pointless. To a much less extent other types of variants are present. There are a few scribal errors where letters have been confused: ד for ר in עברי (1:9); ו for י in מי (3:9); כ for ב in בצל (4:5). There are a few instances where a verbal form may have been changed: e.g., ויברח instead of לברח (1:3) in one ms. And there are other cases of scribal errors, where one or a few mss may be missing a word or phrase. None of these variants, however, is sufficient either in kind or in number to merit closer study. Their unimportance demonstrates clearly the uniformity existing among Jonah mss.

---

[1] "Attacks on Lagarde's position show at most that he overstates his case" (Cross, op. cit., p. 126). "...there was a standardization of the text, perhaps before the time of our Lord, but more likely after the fall of Jerusalem..." (Roberts, op. cit., p. 29). Cf. also Thomas, op. cit., p. 245.

[2] A possible exception to this statement is that in some cases their absence or presence may lead to erroneous pointing. See Roberts, op. cit., p. 94.

In all essentials the text from Murabba'at belongs to the same traditions as do our other extant mss. Only five differences exist between this text and that in BH_3:[1]

1) A blank between the words הים and הולך in 1:13, which is due to a defect in the parchment;

2) the preservation of נקי in its usual form in contrast to the unusual נקיא in 1:14 of MT;

3) the use of the preposition (על אלהים) rather than of אל in 3:8;

4) the *plene* form היטיב rather than the *defectiva* (4:9);[2]

5) the running together of ואי and ואימזה(מזה) in 1:8; in the MT they are separated by a metheg.

As can be readily seen, none of these variants is significant. Thus Mur. 88 testifies to the standardization of the consonantal text of *Jonah* from about the time of the Council of Jamnia.

The Mp attached to *Jonah* in BH_3 provides some interesting information, but its significance is minimal. It is not always indicated whether a given note applies to *Jonah* only, to the book of the Twelve, to the prophetic canon, or to the entire OT (cf., e.g., the Mp on וקרא in 1:2; on תרשישה in 1:3; on ישעתח in 2:10). Some of the notations are virtually impossible to check: e.g., that ואת־יהוה (1:9) occurs 10 times in the OT. Finally, Mp does not consistently comment on unusual forms; e.g., it says nothing about the strange word קיקיון in 4:6ff.

---

[1] See Benoit, *op. cit.*, pp. 184, 205.

[2] Mur. 88 of *Jonah* does not exhibit an abundant use of *scriptio plena*, a fact which distinguishes it from the MT. (Cf. Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 282).

If one could assume without question that the Hebrew text of the Bible is always to be preferred to translations of it - particularly so when that text contains no major difficulties - then the need to examine and evaluate the versions would be superfluous. This was the assumption of scholars for hundreds of years, but in the eighteenth century the tide began to turn until Lagarde was claiming that

> M was so corrupt that it could not be used with a good conscience until an emended text of LXX was forthcoming.[1]

To see the problem simply in terms of MT or LXX is to fail to comprehend it. As already shown for MT, the Hebrew does not give us one official text, even though there is a uniformity about its tradition. And further the condition of MT varies considerably from book to book so that no over-all generalization is correct. For example, within the Minor Prophets the text of Hosea is most corrupt, while that of Jonah not at all. Each book must be studied and evaluated separately. As for the LXX, the story is even more complex, for out of a "maze of mss"[2], bearing the stamps of many different strands of thought, both Jewish and Christian, the scholar must endeavor to establish the proto-Septuagint.

Jonah affords only a taste of these difficulties. For example, there are a few places where the Greek witnesses vary in vocabulary (see e.g., on 1:6;9; 2:4,5; 4:1,2,8); there are others where recensions of the LXX (specifically GS) appear to revise the LXX to conform to a Hebrew text (see 2:6). Fortunately in Jonah these problems appear minimal and are easily recognizable. The Septuagintal mss agree.[3] The variants in the other Greek witnesses do not pose insoluble obstacles; by and large they are more literal renderings of the Hebrew Vorlage than is the LXX.

---

[1] Katz, op. cit., p. 198. [2] See Cross, op. cit., pp. 128-129.

[3] This statement is neither startling nor new. Ziegler has already demonstrated in several articles that the LXX of the Twelve was the work

When one finds sufficient harmony among the Septuagintal mss of Jonah, then the next issue which confronts him is the nature of the relationship between LXX and MT. The issue centers in the variants between the two.

> Does the Septuagint in a given passage witness to an ancient Hebrew Text at variance with the textus receptus, or are its divergent readings to be explained away as due to translation procedures?[1]

The variants have already been studied wherever they appear in Jonah. Suffice it here to classify them.

1) The question of how to render the idioms of one language into an alien tongue is a thorny one for translators. Basically the choice is to literalize or to paraphrase, and the LXX has made use of both alternatives. If one considers two imperatives together, minus a conjunction, idiomatic Hebrew, then it is to be noted that LXX inserts και between its translations of קום and לך in 1:2 and 3:2. As for Hebrew particles, LXX has preserved them faithfully at some points (e.g., אנה in 1:14) and omitted them in others (אנה in 4:2; נא in 4:3; 1:8, 14). The idiomatic expression אך אוסיף להביט (2:5) LXX renders literally, while the idiom הולך וסער (1:11) it paraphrases. Consistency is not a characteristic of this translation.

2) In cases where a Hebrew idiom is not actually involved, the LXX may translate literally or it may interpret. In 1:9 it accurately reads

---

of one translator only. For a bibliography of his work, see Katz, op. cit., p. 196f.

[1] Cross, op. cit., p. 130.

היבשה as ξηραν but in 1:13 that very same word is rendered by γην . It paraphrases רעתם as η κραυγη της κακιας αυτης (1:2). And most likely it interprets 3:2 in an attempt to clarify.

3) There are a number of instances where LXX tries to clarify an apparent awkwardness or confusion in MT: the singular αυτης (1:2); the masculine suffix ναυλον αυτου (1:3); the preposition in εις βαθη (2:4). It removes the double object in 1:16, and it re-divides 2:6. On the other hand, it does not change the לו of 4:6, nor the redundant אשר...בו of 4:10. Again, one notes a lack of consistency in its handling of difficulties.

4) In four places where the reading of LXX diverges from MT, the difference lies only in the pointing of the consonantal test: שועתי (2:3); יסבבני (2:4); סוף (2:6) and להציל (4:6).

5) There are a few cases of omissions and/or additions between LXX and MT. The chief omission is the phrase באשר...לנו of 1:8, which does not appear in the two important codices א and B. Further, א contains the error of homoeoteleuton in 1:3. In most Septuagintal mss the adjective גדולה(μεγος)is missing in 1:4, the verb שוב in 3:9, and the Divine Name אל in 4:2. Conversely, the name κυριος is added in 4:3 and the phrase τον θεον μου in 2:3.

6) Finally, there are a few real discrepancies between LXX and MT, be they deliberate or not. As pointed out, the word עברי (1:9) is misread. The numeral τρεις in 3:4 is not attested in the Hebrew. And the hapax קיקיון is wrongly rendered in LXX, no doubt because the precise meaning of the term was unknown to the translators.

When one considers the relatively small number of notable variants between LXX and MT, one conclusion suggests itself: that the LXX reflects the *Hebraica veritas*. Taking into account the fact that every translation is inevitably an interpretation, with possibly "deliberate and intentional changes",[1] and the fact that one can neither expect nor demand internal consistency or always accuracy within a given translation, then we can conclude that the LXX of *Jonah* is a faithful translation of its Hebrew *Vorlage* (our *Textus Receptus*).[2]

With a few individual differences, the remaining versions supply only additional evidence of the preceding conclusions. As would be expected, V reflects the MT for the most part. In a few instances, however, it does follow another reading more closely (see 1:2,5; 4:6). OL is ninety-nine per cent the Septuagintal text; it really has no intrinsic value as a witness. The Aramaic *Jonah* is often a paraphrase (e.g., 1:1,2, 14: 2:8), but the paraphrases appear true to the meaning of the Hebrew text. Finally, the Peshitta does conform with LXX in many places, but this conformity ought not to obscure numerous deviations. For example, in parts of each of the following vs S is not in agreement with LXX: 1:5, 6; 3:4; 4:6,8. S has its own peculiar alteration of the difficult חסדם in 2:9, its own translation of אדרתו in 3:6, and its own gloss for the answer of Jonah in 4:8. It makes minor insertions, as in 1:3; 4:9,10. Sometimes it rearranges the text (e.g., 1:10,12). While the Syriac translation of *Jonah* does not bear out Roberts' general observation that the

---

[1] Roberts, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

[2] Thus, neither the statement made about the LXX of *Jonah* by Roberts nor that by Oesterley and Robinson (cf. p. 2) is accurate. As for the first, the LXX cannot be of "considerable help in restoring the MT", since MT needs no restoration. As for the second, the LXX of *Jonah* *is* of value in confirming or bearing witness to the authenticity of our Hebrew text.

Peshitta of the Twelve is "fairly freely translated" (cf. p. 9), it does point at places in that direction.

A final word is in order about methodology. At the beginning of this chapter we maintained a rather sharp distinction between Lower and Higher Criticism. The former discipline is the prerequisite for the latter. In conclusion it is important to recognize that textual criticism does raise issues which that discipline itself cannot solve: e.g., the difficulties presented by the word חִשְּׁבָה in the Hebrew and in the versions (1:4c); the meaning of the verb ירא with its various Gk renderings (1:9); the pointing and resultant meaning of the infinitive לְהַצִּיל and the appearance of the preposition ל(ו) in 4:6. A critical study of the text alone discloses these and similar problems, but it does not provide a solution for them. In such cases it is necessary to draw upon other disciplines, such as form-criticism and exegesis. Accordingly, certain conclusions about the text may await the study of the context.

CHAPTER II

LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ISSUES

Introduction

Once the state of the text of a passage is determined, the foundation has been laid for a consideration of the issues of Higher Criticism. Although traces of this discipline may be detected as early as the second century A.D., it was not until after the Reformation that literary and historical investigations of the Bible began to flourish.[1] Influenced by the rise of the scientific spirit, scholars began to subject each book of the Bible to critical appraisal as a necessary prerequisite towards understanding its meaning.[2] Various concerns of this approach must engage us now as they pertain to Jonah.

A. Composition

1. Nature of the Task

Analysis of the composition of a biblical book has been called "the initial task of the higher critics."[3] Its aim is to discover whether a given book is a literary unit or a composite work. Strictly speaking, to call it a unit is to aver that all of it has come down to us from the pen of one author (or school of authors) writing in a particular time; to call it a composite piece is to assert that the present book contains sources of diverse origins and time. Variations within each of these two alternatives are also possible.

---

[1] For a historical survey of the rise and development of Higher Criticism, see Pfeiffer, op. cit., pp. 43-49; S. Terrien, "History of the Interpretation of the Bible: Modern Period," IB I, pp. 127-141.

[2] See Herbert F. Hahn, Old Testament in Modern Research, pp. 1-43.

[3] Ibid., p. 3.

2. Survey of the Major Theories

The many theories proposed about the composition of *Jonah* disclose a wide diversity of opinions among scholars. These views can be classified under four categories. The first maintains that *Jonah* is a unit. This, of course, was the pre-critical assumption about the make-up of the book. Challenges to its validity have come with the rise of Higher Criticism, and they have necessitated a defense of this position by those who support it. Among nineteenth century presentations of this view, the remarks of Kleinert (1875) are of special interest. In the context of discussing the date of *Jonah*, he states:

> The unity of the book, which has been denied by Nachtigal, with much ingenuity, is internally and externally quite indivisable.[1]

At the same time, however, Kleinert finds in Chapters 3 and 4 two accounts of the same event which one author put together "in systematic form."[2] Accordingly, Kleinert is in the ambiguous position of affirming the unity of *Jonah* while admitting that the last two chapters are compilations.[3] A second representative of the last century is Orelli (1893). His view of the unity of *Jonah* is also obscured. Orelli recognizes certain difficulties in regard to the Psalm in Chapter 2, which he says the author of

---

[1] Paul Kleinert, "The Book of Jonah" in John Peter Lange, *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: The Minor Prophets*, p. 9.

[2] *Idem.*

[3] Bewer (*op. cit.*, p. 14) seems not to recognize this ambiguity in Kleinert's view; nor does A. Feuillet ("Le Livre de Jonas," p. 9).

Jonah did not compose but found "ready to hand."[1] This Psalm is an integral part of the original story, most certainly giving "the contents of Jonah's prayer in the fish's belly."[2] Yet the Psalm is not in the most appropriate place.[3] It gives thanks _after_ salvation while in the story of Jonah such deliverance is still to come. Recognition of this awkwardness does not lead Orelli to doubt the unity of the book. Nor does he attempt to explain why the author placed the Psalm at this point. He resorts only to a _non sequitur_ in concluding that the author would have introduced the Psalm at a more fitting place if he himself had composed it![4] Writing two years later (1895), John Kennedy also argues for the total unity of the book.[5]

More recent proponents of a theory of unity see the problem of the Psalm as the primary threat to their position. Döller (1912) maintains that individual expressions in the Psalm which seem not to fit Jonah's situation, such as the references to weeds and to Sheol, ought not to be pressed to the point of denying the genuineness of the Psalm in context.[6] He claims that the poem fits the repentant attitude of Jonah, who at that point is willing to undertake his assigned mission. George Adam Smith (1929)[7] allies himself with Orelli in holding that the author of _Jonah_ inserted the Psalm exactly where it now appears, regardless of whether or not he wrote it. Smith contends that even the position of the Psalm is proper, for from the standpoint of the author Jonah was already saved when he was swallowed by the fish.[1] Smith concludes that our present book is substantially the original composition.[2] A. Feuillet (1947) also vouches for the unity of Jonah in saying that the reasons advanced for extracting the Psalm are not decisive.[3] Unlike Smith, he acknowledges the difficulty of the Psalm in context but justifies this phenomenon by pointing to parallel passages in Scripture whose integrity he apparently thinks unquestionable.[4] Further, he argues for the inclusion of the Psalm on theological grounds, i.e., that its expression of grace is an indication that Jonah is at the mercy of God. To call it an interpolation is to miss the intention of the author.[5] G. Aalders (1948) follows substantially the position of Feuillet.[6] Yet he admits no awkwardness in the present location of the Psalm. Unlike both Smith and Feuillet, he finds not even minor glosses elsewhere in the text. For Aalders Jonah is a unit in toto.

---

[1] C. von Orelli, _The Twelve Minor Prophets_, p. 168.

[2] _Ibid_., p. 169. [3] _Ibid_., p. 167. [4] _Ibid_., p. 169.

[5] John Kennedy, _On the Book of Jonah_, pp. 30-36.

[6] Döller, _Das Buch Jona_, pp. 6, 13.

[7] George Adam Smith, _The Book of the Twelve Prophets_, p. 499.

In defending the unity of Jonah these men have touched upon some of the problems which have led other scholars to the very opposite view that Jonah is composed of numerous sources. Perhaps a transitional figure in this shift from unity to diversity is Kleinert, who, as we have seen, maintained both positions without recognizing any incongruity. To be sure, Kleinert was not the first to suggest the possibility of sources in Jonah;[1] he himself cites the work of Nachtigal (1799), who divided the book into three sources distinguished by their language, their spirit, and their mode of presentation:[2] (1) the prayer of 2:3-10, which was composed by the eighth century prophet after he was delivered from the hands of an Assyrian king;[3] (2) the historical-poetical apology of Chapters 3-4, which comes from an Israelite exile in Babylonia and is directed against fanatical Jewish particularism; (3) a prosaic introduction (1:1-16; 2:1,2,11; 3:1), which was written by a scribe of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah in order to bring together the first two sources. Kleinert is not alone in rejecting this proposal; in general Jonah scholarship has considered it of no real merit.[4]

---

[1] Idem. [2] Idem.

[3] Feuillet, "Le Sens du livre de Jonas," RB (1947), 343-344; "Le Livre de Jonas" (1951), p. 9f.

[4] "Au reste le défaut d'adaptation au contexte n'est pas un phénomène isolé: qu'on songe au Magnificat, si peu relié à la scène qui vient de se dérouler entre Marie et Élisabeth, ou encore, d'une manière générale, au vague des allusions historiques ou personnelles dans les psaumes, d'où la difficulté de les dater" ("Le Livre de Jones," p. 10).

[5] Feuillet, "Le Sens du livre de Jonas," op. cit., p. 344.

[6] G. Ch. Aalders, "The Problem of the Book of Jonah," pp. 23-25. See also E. J. Young, An Introduction to the OT (1949), pp. 256-258; James Hardee Kennedy, Studies in the book of Jonah (1956).

The source theory of W. Böhme (1887) has commanded attention perhaps because it is rooted firmly in a study of the text.[5] The presence and use of the divine names Yahweh and Elohim in Chapters 3 and 4 Böhme found as strong evidence for composite authorship. Moreover, he scrutinized the entire text to the point of noting even minor unevennesses,[1] and the results of his analysis constitute the most extreme challenge to the unity of *Jonah*. In this little book of 48 verses he counted no less than four distinct authors plus glossators:[2]

---

[1] According to Bewer (op. cit., p. 13), this distinction probably belongs to J. G. A. Müller, who thought that the Psalm was composed by the prophet himself and the narrative by an exilic writer ("Jona, eine moralische Erzählung" in Paulus' Memorabilien VI, 1794, p. 142f). Cf., more recently, D. B. MacDonald, The Hebrew Literary Genius, p. 124.

[2] J. C. K. Nachtigal, Über das Buch des Alten Testaments mit der Aufschrift Jonas in Eichhorn's Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litterature, IX, p. 221f.

[3] A similar idea was expressed by C. Bunsen, who held that the Psalm is genuine, having been composed by Jonah on the occasion of his deliverance from the sea; this Psalm gave rise to the narrative as we have it (Gott in der Geschichte, I, 1857, pp. 349-382).

[4] See Bewer, op. cit., p. 14; K. Marti, Das Dodekapropheton, p. 243.

[5] W. Böhme, "Die Composition des Buches Jona," ZAW 7 (1887), 224-284.

(1) A, the Yahwist narrator who was the author of the core of Chapters 1-4.

(2) B, the Elohist author of a narrative parallel to the Yahwist in Chapters 3 and 4.

(3) R, presumably an Elohist redactor, who united A and B.

(4) C, the Yahwist enlarger of ABR in Chapters 1 and 4, who also inserted the Psalm which comes from an unknown earlier poet.

(5) The author or authors of many smaller insertions throughout the book, the last gloss being the phrase in 1:8a which is missing from the LXX.

---

[1] For instance, Böhme finds numerous reasons to doubt the integrity of 1:3. Since the sailors are obviously not fleeing from Yahweh, the end of the verse is suspect; moreover, since the combination of the verb בוא with the phrase מלפני יהוה occurs nowhere else, the presence of this phrase is probably due to a glossator. Further, the thrice-repeated expression 'to Tarshish' seems strange; Böhme would delete its first appearance because logically the destination of Jonah is not known at that point in the story. Then in 1:4 he would regard ויהי " בים as an addition because it offers nothing new to the narrative, because the גדול may be but a repetition of the earlier occurrence of this adjective in the v, and because the entire clause only reflects the expressions הולך וסער in 1:11 and סער גדול in 1:12. He concludes, then, that it is clearly an addition(*op. cit.*, pp. 225-226). In this way Böhme continues his examination of the text, imposing upon it a very strict criterion of logic and also assuming that repetitions indicate duplications.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 284.

It seems evident that Böhme's theory is too complicated to commend itself.[1] It imposes upon Jonah criteria which are not indigenous to the material itself.[2] One is inclined to dismiss it as does Cornill: "lediglich ein Kuriosum."[3]

Another attempt to distinguish sources in Jonah was made by Wilhelm Erbt (1907).[4] It is noteworthy not because of its tenability but because of its approach to the problem by way of metrical criticism. In addition to the Psalm and a number of glosses, Erbt thought he found two sources in the book which could be distinguished by meter. One source he claimed to be a continuation of the Elijah stories and the other a sequel to the Elisha narratives.[5] On different grounds, G. W. Wade (1925) argued also for a two-source theory.[6] According to him, the Psalm is a later insertion, and the prose narrative is composed of two versions of a single story. The use of the Divine Names is the clue to detecting the two sources.

---

[1] For evaluations of it see, e.g., Marti, op. cit., p. 243; Nowack, Die Kleinen Propheten, p. 192; Bewer, op. cit., p. 15f.

[2] It is interesting that Böhme's own presentation does not meet the standards of logic and consistency which he presumes are requirements for literary unity. For example, he considers the first Tarshish in 1:3 a gloss because Jonah would not logically have known his destination; yet he fails to apply this criterion to the similar context of 4:2 and in fact assigns that Tarshish to yet a different author, namely the Yahwist enlarger (C). Marti (op. cit., p. 243) also notes the inconsistency of Böhme's assigning 4:7a and 9 to the Yahwist narrator when both verses use the divine name Elohim.

[3] C. H. Cornill, Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, p. 209.

[4] Wilhelm Erbt, Elia, Elisa, Jona, esp. pp. 26-28; 48-49.

[5] Bewer's evaluation of Erbt's view suffices: "His method is arbitrary and his division untenable" (op. cit., p. 20).

[6] G. W. Wade, The Books of the Prophets Micah, Obadiah, Joel and Jonah, pp. lxxxv-xc.

A third view of the composition of Jonah is that the book consists of interpolations, transpositions, and glosses. K. Kohler (1879) approached the issue of composition on the assumption that the nucleus of the story is to be dated very early while much of the language of the present book are late Aramaisms.[1] On this basis he subjected the book to a drastic dissection and concluded that a later reviser was responsible for numerous alterations, interpolations, and transpositions.[2] H. Winckler (1879) sought the answer to the relatively few difficulties which he detected primarily in terms of transpositions and omissions.[3] He put 1:13 after 1:4, 1:10 after 1:7, and 4:5 after 3:4. In 4:6 he omitted "to be a shade upon his head." In 4:8 he added after the phrase "east wind" the clause, "and it tore down the hut."

H. Schmidt (1905) is another representative of this third view of composition. Schmidt acknowledges his debt to Böhme, even though he does not accept Böhme's theory of sources.[4] Following the lead of earlier critics[5] who regarded the Psalm as an insertion, Schmidt attempts to explain this insertion on religious grounds, i.e., that it was added to alleviate what appeared to a later editor as too sudden a change in the original story from God's anger to His mercy.[1] The reference to prayer in 2:2 provided the introduction for this expansion. Likewise, in other parts of the book insertions are based on some statement already present in the story.[2] Besides insertions, Schmidt thought he found evidence for an independent narrative in 1:1-10, now interwoven with the rest of the story.

---

[1] K. Kohler, "The Original Form of the Book of Jonah," TR 64 (Jan. 1879), 139-144.

[2] Ibid., p. 140; for Kohler's reconstruction of the original story, purged of all revisions, see pp. 141-142.

[3] Hugo Winckler, "Zum buche Jona," AF, pp. 263-265.

[4] Hans Schmidt, "Die Komposition des Buches Jona," ZAW 25 (1905), 285-310.

[5] Viz., de Wette, Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung, p. 298; and Knobel, Prophetismus der Hebräer, II, p. 377.

The Roman Catholic scholar Paul Riessler (1911) has been strongly influenced by the work of Schmidt as well as of Böhme.[3] Perhaps because of their thorough studies Riessler does not present in detail his own view of composition. In general he avers that Jonah bears the marks of repeated revisions; within it are to be found many insertions and glosses.[4]

As can be readily seen, there is a great diversity of opinion among scholars who represent this third view of the composition of Jonah. Schmidt and Riessler see evidence of many revisions in our present book, and in this respect they are close to the extreme position of Böhme. On the other hand, Winckler finds neither as many nor as difficult threats to the unity of Jonah, and in this respect he points the way to a fourth theory of composition: Jonah is a unit except for the Psalm and a few alterations.[1]

---

[1] Schmidt, op. cit., p. 286.

[2] E.g., 3:6-9 is an expansion of 3:5; 1:13,14 expand the question of 1:12 (see op. cit., pp. 287-289).

[3] Paul Riessler, Die kleinen Propheten, pp. 153-164.

[4] One distinctive mark of Riessler's theory centers in vs 6 and 7 of the Psalm. He holds these to be the original prayer of Jonah, with the rest of the Psalm as a later addition (op. cit., p. 159). Riessler is one of the last scholars to adhere to a composite theory of the composition of Jonah. In the last fifty years scholarship has moved decidedly away from the second and third views presented here.

3. Examination of the Evidence

a. The Psalm

In considering the place of the Psalm in Jonah, one looks first at its relationship to the whole. In form it is obviously poetry while the rest is prose.[2] Theoretically there is no reason why the same author could not employ both media of expression; consistency per se is not a test of unity. It is of some interest, however, that the other two prayers recorded in the book are in prose (1:14; 4:2-3). Moreover, while the words in these two petitions blend harmoniously with the rest of the tale, the vocabulary of the Psalm is sharply distinguished from the prose narrative. One notable difference is the abundance of so-called Aramaisms[3] in the prose section and the absence of these in the Psalm.[1] This difference can hardly be accounted for as a distinction between prosaic and poetic writing. Clearly the Psalm does not reflect the same linguistic milieu as the narrative. Not only is it out of place in terms of style and vocabulary but also it damages the symmetry of the book.[2] *Jonah* is designed in two major sections which are introduced by the identical phrase ויהי דבר־יהוה אל־יונה (1:1; 3:1).[3] If one places these two prose sections side by side, he finds an amazing correspondence between them both in length and in substance - a correspondence which is marred by the presence of the Psalm. Besides the identity of opening phrases, the whole of 1:1-3a is reproduced, *mutatis mutandis*, in 3:1-3a. A number of phrases or words which occur in the first section re-appear in the second: e.g., ויתפלל " אל־יהוה (2:2; 4:2); לברח תרשישה (1:3; 4:2); וימן (2:1; 4:6,7) *etc*. From all this it would seem that the author of the narrative has striven to achieve a balance of form and that the Psalm does not fit at all in this scheme. It disrupts the symmetry by increasing the first section out of proportion and by sticking out as a "misfit" in form and vocabulary. Finally, the Psalm is not an integral part of the story; it can be removed without disturbing the narrative at all.[4] The direct connection of 2:11

---

[1] Though they differ on the number and kinds of minor alterations, the following scholars, inter alia, are in substantial agreement that the prose section of Jonah is a unit to which the Psalm does not belong: Marti, Nowack, van Hoonacker, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Cornill, Bewer, Driver, Oesterley and Robinson, Sellin, Eiselen, Pfeiffer, Bentzen, Eissfeldt, Budde, Weiser, Smart, Wolff, Kaufmann, Rowley, Delcor, Gunkel, von Rad, etc.

R. E. Wolfe probably belongs in this group also. According to his "strata hypothesis", the Minor Prophets were combined in various stages and exhibit various editorial changes. Along with Joel and Obadiah, Jonah was added to the Book of Six (Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah) about 310-300 B.C. by a school of writers called the Eschatologists. Apart from the Psalm, Jonah received no editorial additions ("The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," ZAW 53 (1935), 90-129, esp. pp. 90f, 107f).

[2] Even Sievers, who tried to show that the entire book was originally poetry, differentiated between the Psalm and what is the narrative section. While attempting to cast the latter in smooth hexameter meter, he noted that the qinah meter of the Psalm sets it apart as an extraneous piece of poetry (Miscellan, p. 36).

[3] Some of the so-called Aramaisms may be instead Phoenician-North Israelite linguistic peculiarities (see on Date). Regardless of which they are, the point being made here remains the same: the Psalm does not reflect the numerous linguistic peculiarities present in the narrative.

---

[1] See Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

[2] For an argument based on symmetry this writer is indebted to E. J. Young (*op. cit.*, p. 257) with the very important difference that Young uses this argument to retain the Psalm in the original composition. Our investigations would negate Young's declaration that "...if 2:2-9 be removed, the symmetry of the book is destroyed."

[3] See Chapter III for a full discussion of symmetry.

[4] Cf. Smart, "Jonah," *IB*, p. 874: The Psalm has "the appearance of an interpolation", since the narrative hangs together without it.

to 2:2 provides a smooth and consistent movement in the development of the story.[1]

These literary discrepancies are strengthened by a study of the context and the content of the Psalm. After trying in vain to return to dry land because of the severity of the storm which was upon them, the sailors follow an earlier suggestion of Jonah to hurl him into the sea in order to quiet the tempest. This they do reluctantly, praying that Yahweh will not place "innocent blood" upon them (1:15). The result is the cessation of the storm. The author concludes this particular episode by reporting that the sailors sacrifice to Yahweh (1:16). Then he turns his attention upon Jonah with the words וימן יהוה דג גדול לבלע את־יונה (2:1). The clear implication is that the fish swallowed Jonah immediately upon his being tossed overboard. While in the belly of the fish, the prophet prays to Yahweh. In this context the Psalm occurs. After that we read: ויאמר יהוה לדג ויקא את־יונה אל־היבשה (2:11).

Now a study of the Psalm shows that it is not actually a prayer, as 2:2 would indicate, but rather it is a song.[2] Its content is not petition but thanksgiving (Danklied). The thanksgiving is for rescue from a drowning[3] which is described in some detail. Yet there is no evidence in the prose narrative that Jonah was ever in danger of drowning. Upon his being thrown into the sea, a fish swallowed him. No time is allowed for him to experience the conditions of drowning so elaborately depicted in the Psalm (e.g., 2:5-6).[1] Moreover, what is said in the Psalm does not harmonize with the content of the narrative.[2] According to 2:4 the Psalmist was cast into the heart of the sea by Yahweh himself, when in fact Jonah was hurled into the sea by the sailors at his own request. Again, there is not a single reference in the Psalm to Jonah's abode in the belly of the fish. It speaks of a cry "from the belly of Sheol" (2:3)[3] but nothing of a cry "from the belly of a fish"; it speaks of weeds which wrap around one's head at the bottom of the sea[4] but nothing of the conditions of life inside a fish.[5] The location mentioned in the

---

[1] Robinson, op. cit., p. 118.

[2] Numerous scholars have observed this fact, including Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 379; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 589; and Cornill, op. cit., p. 210.

[3] The drowning need not be interpreted literally; it may be symbolic. Bentzen claims that the Psalm is one of thanksgiving for salvation from death. "It has nothing to do with a salvation from dangers at sea...." Introduction to the OT, II, p. 145. Cf. also Bewer. op. cit., p. 23.

---

[1] Thus those who argue for the integrity of the Psalm on the basis that it is a thanksgiving for salvation from a drowning rightly perceive its content but wrongly apply it to Jonah. E.g., Smith, op. cit., p. 499; Aalders, op. cit., p. 24. "To be swallowed by a fish is usually not the same as to be saved!" (Bewer, op. cit., p. 22). Cf. also Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., pp. 379-380: "It is evident that the psalm expresses the grateful outpouring of one who had been nearly drowned, whereas in the case of Jonah there is no question of drowning." Or if there be a question of Jonah's drowning - literal or figurative - then the danger is for him a present reality in the belly of the fish, not a past experience from which he has been saved. From either perspective the Psalm does not fit.

[2] Even Orelli admits its unsuitability in context. He thinks that "without doubt" it comes from a shipwrecked man (op. cit., p. 168). See also Driver, op. cit., p. 325.

[3] This phrase lends support to Bentzen's contention that the Psalm is not even concerned with a literal, physical drowning but rather with death. Pfeiffer seems to view it similarly when he paraphrases or interprets מבטן שאול as "from hell" (op. cit., p. 589).

[4] Commentators are fond of quoting Wellhausen's terse remark: "Im Bauch des Fisches wächst auch kein Seegras" (op. cit., p. 212).

[5] Smart summarizes (op. cit., p. 874): "Nowhere is there any suggestion that he is praying from the belly of a fish."

Psalm is the temple itself, to which the psalmist has come to give thanks (2:8);[1] this is not at all Jonah's location. And by no stretch of interpretation are the last two vs (2:9-10) suitable in the over-arching context.[2] For many reasons, then, the contents of the Psalm simply do not fit the context.[3]

Additional evidence for this conclusion may lie in contrasting the mood of the Psalm vis-a-vis the mood of Jonah as given in the narrative. Generally commentators have not considered the force of this psychological argument, but it seems worthy of mention. The story begins with Jonah fleeing from the presence of Yahweh; this is the sole purpose of his sea-journey to Tarshish. Then the storm makes it clear to him that he has not escaped Yahweh. Having explained the situation to the sailors and thereby assumed full responsibility for the storm, Jonah commands that they throw him overboard to stop the tempest (1:12). Now the motive behind this command is not supplied by our author. It has been interpreted as an ironic act of nobility on Jonah's part; the prophet who is running away from a command to preach to the Gentiles here offers "to sacrifice his own life that the others in the boat might be saved from the storm."[1] While this interpretation may be legitimate, it is also possible that Jonah offers "to sacrifice his own life" in order to escape permanently the command of Yahweh; to die would be the ultimate and final way of saying no to God. It is purely incidental that the sailors will be saved, although on the surface this fact lends magnanimity to Jonah's ulterior motive.[2] If this understanding be correct, then the irony of the situation is disclosed in 2:1 - Jonah does not die; Yahweh cannot be escaped. Following this experience, the prophet does not change his attitude toward Yahweh's command. To be sure, he goes to Nineveh, but subjectively he does not really obey. His mood is still that of angry defiance, as is clearly brought out in Chapter 4, where twice he explicitly asks to die (4:3,8). Without exception, in the prose section of the book Jonah is out of harmony with Yahweh; not even at the end is he reconciled. In light of this condition, it appears inconceivable that the Psalm could have been composed originally for the lips of Jonah. He is not a creature of gratitude and thanksgiving. Exactly what his prayer was in the belly of the fish (2:2)[3] we do not know. It may have been a petition for deliverance from the fish, as is suggested by the action of Yahweh in 2:11. At any rate, it was certainly not the song of thanksgiving in 2:3-10.

---

[1] Y. Kaufmann says that this psalm of thankggiving is connected with the payment of vows in the Temple (The Religion of Israel, p. 310).

[2] See George Buchanan Gray, A Critical Introduction to the OT, p. 215f; T. H. Robinson, op. cit., p. 118.

[3] Bewer observes that the Psalm would "fit better if it followed 2:11", i.e., as thanksgiving after Jonah has been delivered from the dangers of the fish and of the sea (op. cit., p. 21f). Cornill also recognizes that the end of Chapter 2 is a more suitable place and thinks that if the author of Jonah had himself borrowed the Psalm, he would have put it there (op. cit., p. 211). While this alteration would eliminate certain problems posed by the Psalm, it would not substantially strengthen its integrity in the book, as Bewer recognizes: "But even then it cannot be maintained that the psalm was composed by the author of the story."

---

[1] Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 872.

[2] See S. D. F. Goitein, "Some Observations on Jonah," JPOS 17 (1937), 68.

[3] It has been suggested that 2:2 may be a gloss, added in order to introduce the Psalm. There is no ms evidence to support this contention nor any other substantial reason. It is interesting, however, that only in this vs is the feminine דגה used to speak of one fish (see the relevant remarks on the text of 2:2 in Chapter I).

If the Psalm is not an integral part of the book, two questions arise: who inserted it and why? As for the first, there are two possible answers: (1) The author of the prose section inserted it; (2) it was added by an editor or scribe. Although Driver favors the first alternative,[1] it seems improbable that the author himself would have included a piece so incongruous with the form and content of his prose narrative. Certainly he would have either supplied the substance of the prayer or chosen a more fitting piece, if he had desired to have the content expressed. The second alternative seems more likely: the Psalm was added by an editor or scribe.[2] One can only speculate as to the reason for its presence.[3] Marti says that its addition may reflect the concern of the editor that Jonah failed to give thanks to God for his deliverance.[4] The editor may have thought the Psalm appropriate for the Sitz in which the story of Jonah was used. Those who heard the story needed also to hear the message embodied in the Psalm. Budde and Cornill hold that it may have been included to supply content for the prayer mentioned in 2:2 and to supply "a connected speech of the prophet" which is lacking in the original story.[1] All these critics concur that the editor himself did not compose the Psalm. Had he done so, he would have fitted it better to the tale. Perhaps he found it ready-made in some ancient anthology. In this connection it is interesting to note that Codex A contains this Psalm as one of the Odes at the end of the Psalter.

---

[1] Driver, op. cit., p. 325. That there is a certain ambiguity in this position is evident from the fact that it is held both by those who speak of the entire book as a unit and by those who do not consider the Psalm a part of the unity.

[2] See, inter alia, de Wette, Knobel, Kuenen, Marti, Budde, Cheyne, Robinson, Weiser, Smart, Bewer, Delcor, etc. Pfeiffer thinks that he who inserted the Psalm was probably the editor of the Twelve (op. cit., p. 589). His comment is reminiscent of the view of R. Wolfe (see supra). Observing that psalms are present in 8 prophecies of the Book of the Nine (Nahum, Jonah, Micah, Habakkuk, Amos, Zephaniah, Hosea, Joel, but not Obadiah), Wolfe avers that these psalms were added by "a psalmist or lover of psalms who, missing his favorite type of literature in the prophetic writings, set about to supply it himself." The system of this editor was to put psalms at either the beginning or end of the books, with the single exception of Jonah where 2:2 provides an appropriate setting (op. cit., pp. 111-112).

[3] Note that this kind of insertion is paralleled elsewhere in Scripture: e.g., the song of Hannah (I Sam. 2:1-10); the song of Hezekiah (Isaiah 38:9-20); the apocryphal song of the Three Holy Children (following Dan. 3:23).

[4] Marti, op. cit., p. 242; see also Bewer, op. cit., p. 23. What Feuillet terms "the expression of grace" or the "affirmation of God's mercy" in the Psalm (see supra) is not, as he maintained, a theological reason for its integrity but rather for its insertion.

b. The Divine Names

The appearance and use of the divine names throughout the book, and especially in Chapters 3 and 4, constitute the second major problem of composition.

Yahweh occurs more frequently than Elohim, which also appears with the definite article (האלהים). In Chapter I the relationship and meaning of these terms seem clear. As would be expected, Yahweh is the name of the Deity of Israel. In this sense it is employed by the narrator of the story (1:1,3,4,10,14,16); thus is it used by Jonah himself (1:9); and thus is it placed on the lips of the sailors (1:14). Unlike this peculiarly Hebraic name, the word Elohim is basically a general Semitic appellative for deity. In many places in the OT, however, it does assume the character of a proper name,[2] and sometimes in order to denote this character an article is attached to it.[3] In terms of its general meaning the word is correctly employed in 1:5. Similarly does the captain use it in his command to Jonah (1:6): קרא אל־אלהים and he goes on to specify a particular deity by the article אולי יתעשת האלהים לנו.[1]

---

[1] Budde, "Jonah," JE, p. 228; Cornill, op. cit., p. 210.

[2] See G-K 125f.

[3] Ibid., 126e.

In Chapter 2 the narrator again used *Yahweh* in telling of the fish-episode. The Tetragrammaton appears also in the opening verses of Chapter 3. Thereafter, however, only *Elohim* or *ha-Elohim* is used (3:3,5, 8,9,10) in reference to the repentance of Nineveh. Bewer finds this use consistent with a general principle that in the first three chapters "the divine name used by the heathen" is *Elohim* and that "by the Hebrew" *Yahweh*.[2] But, as Marti has rightly perceived,[3] this principle is an erroneous one:[4] cf. 3:5 (Elohim) with the analogous 1:16 (Yahweh); likewise cf. 3:8 with 1:14. In other words, comparable passages in Chapters 1 and 3 employ different divine names.[5]

This indiscriminate use of the names is heightened in Chapter 4, where no heathens are directly involved at all. *Yahweh* is found in the opening vs (2,3,4) but not again until v 10. *Elohim* is used in vs 7,8, and 9.[6] To complicate the matter the doublet יהוה־אלהים

---

[1] From the standpoint of Jonah himself, both *Elohim* and *ha-Elohim* are synonymous with the name Yahweh (cf. 1:9).

[2] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 64. [3] Marti, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

[4] Bewer himself admits a weakness in his theory in the האלהים of 3:10 where "we might perhaps have expected יהוה " (*op. cit.*, p. 64).

[5] There is no reason to be disturbed by the fact that the Tetragrammaton appears on the lips of heathens, as in 1:14. Similar usages of the sacred name are to be found, e.g., in Gen. 20:4 (E!), a prayer to Yahweh; Ex. 9:27f and other speeches of the Pharaoh; I Kgs. 17:24, *etc.*

[6] Observe that *Yahweh* first asks the question (4:4) and that *Elohim* asks it the second time (4:9).

occurs in 4:6. It ought to be remembered that the Peshitta retains this combination throughout vs 6-9 and that other versions vary in their rendering of the divine names in this chapter.[1]

As we have seen, Böhme tried unsuccessfully to account for these difficulties by source analysis.[2] The appearance and use of the divine names in Jonah simply do not provide that kind of evidence.[3] Certain other scholars speak in terms of revisions. The theory advanced by Marti is that a later reader of Jonah took offense at what he thought were insidious uses of the Tetragrammaton and sought to remedy these by substituting אלהים, whereupon he forgot to remove יהוה in 4:6a.[4] Bewer's proposal is similar: that the original name throughout Chapter 4 was יהוה; that אלהים is the work of a copyist who was influenced by Chapter 3, "but in some instances the orig. readings reasserted themselves."[5] Still another view comes from T. H. Robinson: the present readings in Chapter 4 suggest a compilation of two recensions, one of which always used Yahweh and the other Elohim. On the problem of 4:6, Robinson merely notes that the divine names from both recensions have been placed together.[6]

---

[1] See Chapter I.

[2] No doubt Böhme was influenced by the Pentateuchal criticism of his time. Today it is becoming increasingly evident that the criterion of divine names is no longer a strong or conclusive argument for the existence of sources. See the work of the Scandinavian scholars, especially Engnell, and the epigraphical discoveries from Ugarit.

[3] See Eissfeldt, Einleitung, pp. 495-96.

[4] Marti, op. cit., p. 242.

[5] Bewer, op. cit., p. 65.

[6] Robinson, op. cit., p. 125.

None of these suggestions seems totally convincing.[1] The assumption that originally only one divine name was used in Chapter 4 can hardly be substantiated; in other places both names are used and not always as one might expect (e.g., 3:10). Even if one accepts this assumption, it is difficult to see what is offensive (contra Marti) about the Tetragrammaton in Chapter 4 where the dialogue is strictly between the God of Israel and his prophet.[2] The idea of a copyist being "influenced" (Bewer) by Chapter 3 is vague in meaning and turns the copyist into an editor. Finally, these views do not account for the combination יהוה־אלהים in 4:6.[3] It appears that Eissfeldt is right in claiming that a satisfactory solution for the problem of the divine names in Jonah has not yet been found.[4]

---

[1] An altogether different attempt to deal with the problem is presented in the article by Th. Boman, "Jahve og Elohim i Jonaboken," NTT 7 (1936), 159-168. For the thesis of this article the present writer is dependent upon the summary given by Georg Fohrer "Neuer Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie," TR 19 (1951), 315.

According to Fohrer, Boman rejects as unsatisfactory efforts to account for the divine names in terms of two sources. Instead, he proposes that the two names are used to designate different theological emphases: Jahweh means God known as merciful; Elohim means the deus absconditus. Cf. also S. Mowinckel, Gamle, p. 660.

On the basis of this summary, the suggestion by Boman is hardly feasible. Certainly one can cite passages in Jonah where the divine names indicate the opposite of Boman's contention: e.g., The Deity known as merciful is called Elohim in 3:10 (cf. 4:2). In 4:9 Elohim speaks directly to Jonah. Further, in certain passages the two names are used as parallels: cf. 4:4 and 4:9; 2:1 and 4:7,8.

[2] The different names used to ask the same question in 4:4 and 4:9a point up the incredibility of Marti's suggestion. That he recognizes this difficulty also is revealed in his further proposal that 4:4 is a variant to 4:9a, which originated through the mistake of a copyist. And yet, according to his own view, this variant contains the original reading, Yahweh.

[3] Surely forgetfulness (Marti) is no explanation. Moreover, if a scribe wished to read אלהים with the verb ימן here (cf. also 4:7), why did he not make a similar change in 2:1?

[4] Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 496.

Perhaps some of the difficulties which we see in the use of the divine names did not really exist for the Oriental narrator. It is not without import that in Chapter 1, where Jonah is placed among unconverted heathen, a clear distinction is maintained between the use of *Yahweh* and *Elohim*. With the conversion of the Ninevites at the beginning of Chapter 3 (especially v 5), *Elohim* and *Yahweh* would become for them, as always for Jonah, one and the same. Thus, from this point on, there is no need for the narrator to maintain a sharp distinction between the two names. Understandably, then, we find in Chapter 4 examples of their being used in parallel phrases (4:9,10). When to these observations is added a statement by Pedersen that the "changing of the names of God is often quite arbitrary..."[1], the need to find a systematic answer for the use of the divine names in *Jonah* is certainly lessened. A special comment is in order about the combination יהוה־אלהים in 4:6a; in it the two names are clearly linked. It is unnecessary to dismiss it as a "conflation pure and simple"[2] or to make it dependent upon Genesis 2. C. H. Gordon declares that

> The fusing of two names into one is wide-spread in time and area. It is particularly common in ancient Near East divine names. Thus יהוה־אלהים is a single entity and must not be viewed as resulting from the conflation of manuscripts any more than Amon-Re.[3]

---

[1] This statement was not made about *Jonah* but rather about the unreliable use of the divine names as a criterion in Pentateuchal criticism. But the remark has a general relevance for biblical studies. As for *Jonah* in particular, Nowack commented, in connection with the dating of the book, that in late times the divine names are used "thoroughly promiscuously" (durachaus promiscue, *op. cit.*, p. 192).

[2] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[3] Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 51, n(2).

Sufficient evidence is provided in ancient Near Eastern texts to vouch for the authenticity of this reading in Jonah 4:6. What remains a question is why it occurs precisely at this point in the text and nowhere else, i.e., between a set of Yahweh passages and a set of Elohim passages. Perhaps it was used consciously by the author as a literary transition in what appeared otherwise to be a too abrupt shift from one name to the other.[1]

c. Other Matters

In addition to the Psalm and the divine names, specific verses or parts of verses bespeak difficulties of composition. Some of these problems are inherent within the text itself; others seem to have been posed by scholarship.

Chapter 1

Verse 1: The phrase בן־אמתי was declared by Sievers to be a genealogical gloss from II Kings 14:25, primarily because it did not fit into his metrical arrangement of the book.[2] This proposal is groundless.

Verse 3: The contention that the first mention of Tarshish is a later insertion[3] appears unnecessary. That Jonah would not have known the destination of his flight at this time does not prevent the story-teller from anticipating it.

---

[1] The abruptness is particularly evident if critics are correct in removing 4:5 from this context. Nowhere else in the book is there actually so abrupt a change in the divine names. The combination might be a literary device to bridge the change.

[2] Sievers, op. cit., p. 37. From here on the proposals by Sievers which are based primarily on metrical reasons will not be considered.

[3] Sievers, op. cit., p. 37; Bewer, op. cit., pp. 29, 31; Böhme, op. cit., p. 225f.

Verse 4: Smith[1] and Nowack[2] follow the LXX in dropping גדולה but the majority of scholars leave the Hebrew reading intact. Smith alone omits בים but he gives no reason.[3]

Verse 8: As already seen, the weight of textual evidence shows convincingly that the phrase באשר למי־הרעה הזאת לנו is a gloss. Its deletion is accepted by many scholars.[4]

Verse 9: The ascription אלהי־השמים is omitted by Sievers for metrical reasons;[5] Wellhausen also suspects it.[6] But the title is "quite in prophetic style."[7] Furthermore, there is no real need to alter this entire part of the verse, as do Kohler,[8] Budde,[9] and Bewer,[10] to read: ומלפני יהוה אלהי השמים אני ברה.

The verb ירא is not incompatible in context.[11]

Verse 10: The awkwardness of the final כי clause in this sentence prompts many scholars to recognize it as a later addition.[12] According to Marti,[13] it is the contribution of a glossator who did not want the knowledge of the sailors to be accounted for without a pronouncement from Jonah. Yet this information could have been inferred from Jonah's preceding statement (v 9). In addition to omitting this section some scholars would delete the first כי clause.[1] Smart thinks both were added because the words מה־זאת עשית were read mistakenly as a question rather than as an exclamation. "Both phrases," he concludes, "interrupt the natural flow of the story."[2] While it would appear likely that the final clause is an insertion, the case against the first is not so strong. It is not awkward in context; moreover, in style and vocabulary it blends with the rest of the episode.[3]

---

[1] Smith, op. cit., pp. 501, 506. [2] Nowack, op. cit., p. 194.

[3] Smith, op. cit., p. 506.

[4] E.g., Kohler, Marti, Nowack, Winckler, Wellhausen, Smith, Smart, Lippl, Feuillet, Robinson, Bird, Delcor, Weiser, and Wolff.

[5] Sievers, op. cit., p. 37. [6] Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 507.

[7] Bewer, op. cit., p. 36; Nowack, op. cit., p. 195.

[8] Kohler, op. cit., p. 142. [9] Budde, op. cit., p. 228.

[10] Bewer, op. cit., p. 38. [11] Cf. Chapter I ad loc.

[12] See Wellhausen, op. cit., p. 212; Nowack, op. cit., p. 195; Weiser, ATD, p. 216.

[13] Marti, op. cit., p. 251.

Verse 16: To call את־יהוה a gloss, as some have suggested,[4] would indeed remove from this declaration one of its essential parts.[5]

Chapter 2

As already shown, when the Psalm is removed, v 11 follows neatly after 2:2. Robinson[6] accepts the Septuagintal omission of יהוה in 2:11,[7] but the deletion is not necessary.

Chapter 3

Verse 2: Apparently Budde[8] alone prefers the reading of the LXX and

---

[1] E.g., Sievers, Böhme, Budde, Winckler, Bewer.

[2] Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 883.

[3] After deleting both clauses, Winckler would transpose what remains of this verse behind v 7. His proposal is not generally accepted (see Nowack, *op. cit.*, p. 195).

[4] Sievers, *op. cit.*, p. 38; Procksch in BH^3.

[5] Cf. Marti, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

[6] Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 122.

[7] See Chapter I *ad loc*.

[8] Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

and OL[1] to the MT, which in itself presents no difficulties.

Verse 3: There is no convincing evidence for the view of Riessler that 3b (ונינוה " ימים) is a gloss.[2]

Verse 4: Scholars are divided on whether the numeral 40 or 3 is the original reading.[3] The former number has the weight of textual evidence in its favor. It is preferred here.[4]

Verses 5-8: Several "discrepancies" have been noticed in these vs: (1) The fasting and mourning actually begin *before* the king issues his proclamation; (2) the meaning of the second jussive (אל־ירעו 'pasture') does not accurately pertain to both 'men and beast' (7b); (3) a similar inaccuracy occurs in v 8 where both men and beast are called upon to clothe themselves in sackcloth and to pray to God. To eliminate these differences various suggestions have been made. Kohler removes vs 6,7,8a in their entirety as insertions.[5] Snaith omits אל־ירעו in 7 and והבהמה in 8.[6] In the former suggestion he is supported by Böhme[7] and in the latter by Bewer.[8] Still others omit the entire phrase האדם והבהמה in 8.[1] These deletions assume that these are real discrepancies in the story and that these discrepancies point up problems in composition. These so-called discrepancies disappear, however, once the Gattung of the narrative is examined and understood.[2] Integrity of composition does not depend upon nor does it require logical accuracy, especially in this kind of story. When this fact is recognized, there remains little need or justification for any of the omissions cited above. Smith is no doubt right in maintaining that "the text is original"[3] and that the discrepancies "...are due to the license a writer allows himself when he is telling a tale...."[4]

---

[1] See Chapter I *ad loc*.

[2] He speculates that a glossator deduced the greatness of Nineveh from the 3 (following LXX) days of grace granted in 3:4 and Jonah's making a journey of one day (*op. cit.*, p. 161).

[3] In favor of the Septuagintal reading of 3 are Kohler, Duhm, Riessler, Bewer, and Smart; in favor of 40 are Orelli, Nowack, Wellhausen, Budde, Smith, Robinson, Weiser, and Wolff.

[4] See Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 227.

[5] Kohler, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[6] Snaith, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

[7] Böhme, *op. cit.*, p. 241. Riessler also omits this, plus the rest of the sentence, *i.e.*, ומים אל־ישתו (*op. cit.*, p. 160).

[8] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 55f.

Verse 9: Budde[5] and Smith[6] follow the LXX in omitting ישוב ו but this omission is not necessary.

Chapter 4

Verse 4: Proposals to strike out this question as the mistake of a copyist influenced by the similar question in 4:9[1] have little to commend them. As Smart holds, this question is not an intrusion but is rather the response of Yahweh to the prayer of Jonah in 4:2-3.[2]

---

[1] Inter alia, Böhme, Wellhausen, Nowack, van Hoonacker, and Feuillet. Bewer recognizes that this double omission does not solve the problem, "for these words would hold over as subject from the preceding" (op. cit., p. 56).

[2] See Gattung in Chapter III. [3] Smith, op. cit., p. 522.

[4] Ibid., p. 489. The force of this position is recognized also by Budde, who comments that the words האדם והבהמה "must not be simply stricken out as an addition...for they now fit in admirably with the legendary tone of the whole" (op. cit., p. 228). On the relationship between the genesis of the mourning (3:7) and the royal edict, Cohen says: "The king's decree follows the spontaneous expression of remorse on the part of the people and gives it royal authority" (The Twelve Prophets, p. 146).

[5] Budde, op. cit., p. 227.

[6] Smith, op. cit., pp. 501, 522.

Verse 5: A number of problems are posed by this description of Jonah leaving Nineveh. The reason given for this action is that Jonah was waiting "to see what would happen in the city." At this point in the story the phrase is difficult to comprehend. On the one hand, the stated purpose seems out of place in the context of the events which precede it. By this time Jonah already knows that repentance has taken place in Nineveh. He also knows that Yahweh has already decided not to destroy the city. And it is precisely because he knows beyond a shadow of a doubt that nothing will happen to the city that he is angry. All this is very carefully laid out by the narrator in 3:10-4:3. Thus, the phrase in 4:5, "to see what would happen in the city," does not make sense in the light of what has already happened. Here Jonah has no reason to wait to learn the fate of the city. On the other hand, the phrase also seems out of place in the context of the events which follow it. Nowhere in the remainder of the story (4:6-11) is there even a suggestion of anything further happening in the city. In fact, Nineveh is not a matter of primary concern. After 4:5 it is not mentioned except in the final verse of the book. Significantly, this final reference is *not* to what is presently happening or soon to happen in Nineveh; rather it is to what has happened in the city as recorded in 3:10-4:3. In other words, the description in 4:5 of Jonah waiting "to see what would happen in the city" seems inappropriate to the resolution of the story.

---

[1] So Marti, who thinks it odd that the question is not answered, declares that v 4 is the mistake of a copyist whose eye strayed from the end of v 3 to the same ending of v 8 and then, in anticipation of the beginning of v 9, inserted what is now v 4 (*op. cit.*, p. 256). See also Böhme, *op. cit.*, p. 242 and Budde, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

[2] Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 892.

Another problem in this verse is occasioned by the statement that Jonah makes a booth to be a shade over him. In the very next verse (4:6) Yahweh-Elohim appoints a plant in order to provide Jonah with shade. Moreover, the point of 4:8 is that Jonah has only this plant to rely upon for shade. When it withers, he is exposed to the sun. All this casts doubt on the existence of a booth as described in 4:5. The problem is not simply that both a booth and a plant are provided for Jonah's comfort. Quite the contrary. In our present story the booth and the plant are close together. It is this very proximity which makes the problem so acute. The building of the booth in 4:5 does not make sense in reference to the account of the plant which follows immediately.

From what has been observed thus far it becomes clear that 4:5 contains difficulties in its present context. As it now stands, what this verse is saying is not readily apparent to the reader. The problem is one of composition: how to account for the location of 4:5 in the make-up of the entire narrative.

In our search for a possible solution or explanation, it is important first of all to understand that textual criticism does not offer us any clues in this matter whatsoever. As we have demonstrated previously, the present form of the text of _Jonah_ was established at a relatively early date. Mur. 88 confirms that it was fixed about the turn of the first century A.D. We cannot claim, however, that our present text represents the original text. To equate the two is to make an unwarranted assumption. What lies behind our present text is simply unknown. As of now we possess no materials which would allow us to dig behind this text to study the original composition of the book. We have no fragments of a non-Masoretic recension. Nor do the versions provide us with any evidence for a different text type. In other words, in our present textual criticism of Jonah we have only the standard text with which to work.[1] Yet the issue posed by 4:5 antedates this text. Our problem here does not concern the formation of the present recension but rather the composition of the original narrative. Therefore, it would be fallacious to expect the present form of the text to illuminate the problem. Textual evidence cannot be used either to support or to refute possible solutions, for we are dealing with a matter which lies outside the scope of our textual materials.[2]

Commentators have long recognized the problem posed by 4:5 in the present make-up of the book. The difficulty is not simply the brain-child of Higher Criticism. Even if we dismiss the way in which modern critics handle the problem, we may not disregard the problem itself. Long before nineteenth century critics dealt with this matter, certain of the rabbis were aware of the issue. Radak, Rashi, and Ibn Ezra are among those who seek to explain the meaning of 4:5.[3] Since the rabbis were committed to the defense of the text in all its details, the very fact that these men offered extended explanations at this point demonstrates that they indeed recognized the awkwardness of the verse in its present context. Thus the genuineness of our problem has been acknowledged from very early times.

---

[1] It may be helpful to contrast the state of textual study of Jonah with that of Samuel. In the latter it is possible to dig behind the present form of the text. Versions and DSS fragments afford us a glimpse of text types of Samuel which are conclusively different from or in opposition to that text represented by the proto-Masoretic. In this connection, see Cross, op. cit., pp. 120-145, and J. Jackson, The Ark Narratives: An Historical, Textual, and Form Critical Study of I Sam. 4-6 and II Sam. 6, unpublished dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1962.

[2] Our remarks here are also applicable to discussion about the Psalm.

[3] See infra.

Three different types of solutions have been proposed to explain 4:5. The first maintains that the difficulties in the verse are occasioned by glosses in the present text. Once these glosses are recognized, 4:5 is no more a problem where it now stands in the composition of the book. This is the view of Bewer, who argues for it as follows:[1] Jonah knew that his preaching in Nineveh had effected sincere repentance on the part of the people. Then after three days he left the city and sat down outside in a dejected mood. There is no hint that Jonah entertained any hope that God would yet destroy the city. The reason the narrator had him sit down outside Nineveh was to teach him the lesson which follows in Chapter 4. However, "an ancient reader wondered why he (Jonah) should _stay_ there, and so put in the explanatory statement _until he might see what would happen to the city_." Bewer further asserts that this glossator added to the original verse, "and he made himself a hut and set down under it in the shade." The reason for this addition lay in the mention of 40 days in 3:4. "The glossator read forty in his text and he concluded that if Jonah had to stay so long he would need a hut as a protection from the hot sun." By inserting this phrase, however, he spoiled the point of the plant in the following verses. Bewer concludes that when 4:5b is recognized as an explanatory gloss, the problems posed by the verse disappear.

This particular solution appears exceedingly arbitrary and for that reason has little to commend it. On the one hand, Bewer indicates that the glossator was astute enough to wonder about unexplained matters in the account and also to be concerned about smooth relationships between separate sections of the story (*i.e.*, 3:4 and 4:5). Yet, on the other hand, Bewer implies that the glossator was not keen enough to recognize discrepancies between his "insertions" and the verses immediately following. In conclusion, any proposal to excise sections of the verse seems to be an invention with no valid justification. To an even greater extent this criticism, *mutatis mutandis*, applies to Budde's suggestion that the entire verse be omitted as an insertion.[1]

---

[1] Bewer, _op_. _cit_., pp. 58-59.

A second kind of solution is based on the retention of 4:5 intact in its present location. This proposal has been developed and defended through a variety of different interpretations. One view is that the imperfect waw consecutive verb forms in the verse are to be understood as indicating past action. Thus, they are to be translated as pluperfects: "Now Jonah had gone out of the city and he had sat down...." This proposal is a relatively old one which has been adopted in the past by both Jewish and Christian commentators. As far back as the twelfth century Ebn Ezra was interpreting these verbs as pluperfects.[2] This translation seemed particularly attractive to critics of past generations.[3] Recently it does not seem to have figured prominently in discussions on

---

[1] Budde, JE, p. 228.

[2] See *Mikraoth Gedoloth*.

[3] For the 18th century, see W. Newcome, *An Attempt towards an Improved Version of the Twelve* (1785), p. 7. For the 19th century, see *inter alia*, the works on *Jonah* by Rosenmüller (1827), Hitzig (1831), S. Mitchell (1875). For the early 20th century, see J. Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, IV (1907), pp. 209-211.

4:5.[1] When a pluperfect interpretation is accepted for the tenses in 4:5, then the phrase "until he should see what would happen in the city" is properly understood to refer to the time preceding the actual repentance of Nineveh. Moreover, the problem occasioned by the proximity of the booth and the plant is removed. One can see that the booth was not constructed and, of course, was not in use simultaneously with the plant. Yet this proposal, to interpret the imperfect with waw consecutive as a pluperfect, falters seriously on a point of Hebrew grammar. It is a moot question whether the imperfect with waw consecutive ever denotes the pluperfect. While a few examples of this possibility may be cited,[2] on the whole there is no clear evidence for this usage.[3] Certainly there is no evidence at all for it here in Jonah 4:5.[4] That a pluperfect meaning should be suggested for the verbs in 4:5 is a strikingly clear recognition that the action described in the verse does not fit the setting in which the verse appears. The content of 4:5 is not contemporary with its context. Consequently, to argue for the pluperfect here is actually a statement of the problem rather than a proposal for its solution.

Another way to support the retention of 4:5 intact is through interpretation of its meaning rather than of its tenses. The phrase "that he might see what would happen in the city" has been taken to signify that Jonah clings to a hope that the city will yet be destroyed. This hope may take one of two forms: (1) Jonah may think that the repentance of Nineveh is not really genuine and that in time the city will revert to evil again;[1] (2) or Jonah may think that Yahweh will again change his mind and destroy the city.[2] Yahweh has only been temporarily hoodwinked by the city's repentance.[3] It is further claimed that Jonah's action in 4:5 is his response to Yahweh's question in 4:4, "Dost thou well to be angry?" By this action Jonah hopes that Yahweh will bring to pass the prediction of 3:4.[4] The prophet thinks that his anger may influence Yahweh to send disaster.

---

[1] But see L.H.K. Bleeker, *De Kleine Profeten*, II (1934), pp. 79, 99f; Harris Birkeland, *Zum Hebräischen Traditionswesen* (1938), p. 72; S. Mowinckel, *Gamle* (1944), p. 664.

[2] See G-K 106f.

[3] A discussion of the subject may be found in S.R. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, pp. 84-89.

[4] See esp. Driver, *idem.*, and Pusey, *op. cit.*, p. 423, n44.

Basic to these views is the idea that Jonah himself thinks or hopes that a verdict other than forgiveness and salvation is possible for Nineveh. But this idea receives no support from what we are told in the narrative itself. To the contrary, it is made explicitly clear that Jonah knows for a certainty that no other verdict than salvation is possible. It is this knowledge that Yahweh repents of evil which causes the prophet to flee from his call at the very beginning of the story. It is this same knowledge which provokes his anger when Yahweh's love is expressed concretely towards the Ninevites. Thus the story as it unfolds gives us no basis for assuming that Jonah hopes that Yahweh will change his mind. Jonah knows only too well that such a hope is not even a possibility. This knowledge is the burden of his prayer in 4:2. Therefore, the interpretation outlined above would seem to read into Jonah's mind an idea which is at variance with what is explicitly said in the story itself.

---

[1] Kalisch, *Book of Jonah*, p. 279; Bird, *op*. *cit*., p. 17; Pidge, *op*. *cit*., p. 33.

[2] Myers, "Jonah," p. 175; Orelli, *op*. *cit*., p. 180; Bird, *op*. *cit*., p. 17; Pidge, *op*. *cit*., p. 33; Lanchester, *Obadiah* *and* *Jonah*, p. 68. The Targum's insertion of "finally" in this verse may also be an attempt at interpretation along these same lines. If so, it points to the antiquity of the problem posed by 4:5. (See relevant comments on 4:5 in Chapter I *supra*.)

[3] A combination of these interpretations was suggested by Radak in the 13th century (see *Mikraoth* *Gedoloth*). He commented on 4:5 as follows:
ויצא. מקדם לעיר. ישב לו במקום שהוא מזרח לעיר עד אשר
יראה אולי לא יעמדו בתשובתם ותשוב הגזרה עליהם:

[4] Myers, *op*. *cit*., p. 176. At least one ancient ms did not consider 4:5 an answer to 4:4. SyrArab supplied its own answer to the question of 4:4 (see on 4:4 in Chapter I *supra*).

Moreover, efforts to explain the problem of the booth and the plant along these lines appear to have even less cogency. One explanation is that the booth withered after a short time and thus ceased to provide shade.[1] Its ineffectiveness would then make the appearance of the plant all the more welcome. A slightly different idea is that the booth was simply insufficient in itself to keep the sun off the head of Jonah.[2] Neither of these suggestions rings true. They are no more than opinions with no confirmation in the narrative itself. Furthermore, the issue is not resolved by saying that in an Oriental tale of this kind one ought not to expect logicality. It is important at this point to distinguish between logic and sense. A matter may be logical but not sensible, and _vice versa_. Our concern with the relationship between the booth and the plant is not a matter of logic. It is rather that the existence and purpose of both the booth and the plant do not make sense in their present proximity. If one wishes to retain 4:5 intact, he may just have to admit that there is no workable explanation for the problem occasioned by the proximity of the booth and the plant. Perhaps the recognition of this fact accounts for the silence about this matter on the part of some critics.[1]

---

[1] Kalisch, _op. cit._, pp. 300, 305; Dale, "Jonah," _Expositor_ (1892), p. 12.

[2] Knight, _Ruth and Jonah_, p. 73; R. F. Horton, _The Minor Prophets_, p. 214; D. W. Deere, _The Twelve Speak_, p. 72; S. L. Edgar, _The Minor Prophets_, p. 136.

A third type of solution argues for the transposition of 4:5 intact to follow 3:4. Although this suggestion is usually credited to H. Winckler (1900),[2] the idea may not have originated with him.[3] According to Winckler, the contents of 4:5 make sense only if the verse stands in a context in which Jonah might rightly await the fate of the city. The most appropriate place is immediately after Jonah has pronounced his sentence of doom upon the city (3:4). The prophet then withdrew to see what would happen. He built for himself a booth from which he could observe the events in the city during the coming days.[4]

While portions of Winckler's theory are not feasible,[5] nevertheless his major suggestion that 4:5 follow 3:4 merits serious consideration, especially since it has been accepted by a host of scholars.[1] This transposition clears up the two difficulties posed by the verse in its present context. First, the phrase "to see what would happen in the city" makes sense after 3:4 in relationship both to what precedes and to what follows it. Having predicted the destruction of Nineveh (3:4), Jonah awaits the outcome (4:5), which is then given in 3:5-10. In this setting 4:5 fits the sequence of the narrative. Secondly, in this recovered context the booth and the plant are sufficiently separate so that no problem of contiguity arises. Moreover, here Jonah needs a substantial shelter to protect him while he watches the anticipated fall of Nineveh.

---

[1] E.g., Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

[2] H. Winckler, "Zum buche Jona," AF (1900), pp. 260-265, esp. p. 264.

[3] Before the time of Winckler, P. Bergmann (*Jona*, Strassburg, 1885, p. 79) is said to have made this transposition of 4:5 behind 3:4. Bergmann's work is unavailable to the present writer. See the note on this matter in N. Lohfink, "Jona ging zur Stadt hinaus (Jon 4,5)," BZ 5, No. 2 (July, 1961), 185.

[4] Winckler also proposed that this booth was later blown down by the east wind of 4:8. To 4:8, then, he added, "und der riss die hütte um." Finally, he omitted from 4:6 the phrase "to be a shade upon his head," claiming that only the booth, never the plant, provided Jonah with shade.

The addition and omission are purely arbitrary and perhaps represent an attempt to impose logicality upon a story which by its very nature does not require precision and exactness.

[5] For a thorough criticism of Winckler's position, see N. Lohfink, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-193. Lohfink rejects the transposition of 4:5 altogether and argues for its retention in its present position on the basis of form criticism. See *infra* Chapter III.

One important matter which remains to be considered is the question of why the verse was ever misplaced. Needless to say, no final answer is available. It is interesting that most scholars who accept the transposition do not discuss this question. H. W. Wolff does suggest that the present misplacement is due to a scribal error,[2] but he does not explain further what he means. Another possibility is that the change is a deliberate one. Perhaps an editor thought that Jonah should reply in some way to Yahweh's question in 4:4 and hence used 4:5 to fill what he thought was a gap in the story. It is to be noted that Jonah does reply verbally to Yahweh's identical question in 4:9. This possible explanation for the location of 4:5 in our present texts corresponds to one reason suggested for the insertion of the Psalm in Chapter 2. Just as an editor deemed it necessary to supply the content of Jonah's prayer in 2:2, since the substance of his prayer in 4:2 is given, so here an editor thought it necessary to supply an answer to Yahweh's question, since an answer to the same question is given in 4:9. Finally, however, we must acknowledge that the question of why 4:5 is misplaced lies behind our textual evidence. We can only speculate as to the reason for the transposition.

---

[1] Among those who accept this transposition as representing the original text are Marti, Sellin, Lippl, T. H. Robinson, Nötscher, Weiser, Haller, Pfeiffer ("probably"), H. W. Wolff, G. von Rad (Theologie, II, p. 302 n 16); Rinaldi, "Giona," pp. 210, 212.

[2] H. W. Wolff, "Jonabuch," RGG^3, col. 854.

In conclusion, all these solutions for the problem of 4:5 contain difficulties. No one is clearly and irrefutably the correct answer. Of the three, however, the last commends itself to us as the most feasible. Transposition of 4:5 to follow 3:4 resolves the major problems in the present order of the text. By restoring the original order of the text, it demonstrates that the "problems" posed by 4:5 are only creatures of the present text. Unlike the first solution, transposition does not resort to arbitrary dissection of the verse. Unlike the second solution, it does not resort to a reading in of interpretations which are not supplied in the narrative itself (*eisegesis*). At this point we tentatively accept it as the most plausible solution. Perhaps this is as far as one may go in discussing 4:5 as a problem of composition. Yet this solution *via* transposition may receive further confirmation in our form critical study of *Jonah* *infra*.

Verse 6: Some scholars find two infinitive phrases awkward:

להיות צל על־ראשו להציל לו מרעתו

Wellhausen[1] and Smith[2] follow Böhme[3] in regarding the second phrase as a doublet of the first and hence to be omitted. Winckler would strike out the first.[4]

---

[1] Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 213. [2] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 527, n 3.

[3] Böhme, *op. cit.*, p. 251. [4] Winckler, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

Nowack has implied that they are both secondary.[1] Assuming that his deletion of 4:5b is correct, Bewer then says that both of these infinitive clauses are original.[2] This same conclusion can be maintained when 4:5 is transposed.

Verse 10: Like Böhme, Riessler omits this entire section שבן־לילה היה ובן־לילה אבד.[3] He holds that the phrase was inserted by a scribe who misunderstood the 'aorist' meanings of the verbs in 4:6, *i.e.*, that Yahweh *had* prepared the plant before Jonah arrived. Originally, then, the growth of the plant was not a miracle; it was not a "son of the night."[4] But there is no problem in the text itself to require this change; the suggestion seems to be based only on speculation.

Verse 11: Although Schmidt[5] and Sievers[6] suspect ובהמה רבה is secondary, Bewer rightly points out that "it is safeguarded by 3:7f."[7]

4. Conclusion

The results of our examination of *Jonah* show the unlikelihood of its being either a unit *in toto* or a composite work. In all probability the Psalm is a later insertion. Apart from it, however, very few alterations in composition are apparent: the glosses in 1:8a and in 1:10d and, tentatively, the misplacement of 4:5. Other unevennesses in the story can be accounted for without positing multiple authorship or extensive editing. Some of these so-called unevennesses are only problems for a logical mind which seeks to impose precision upon the tale - a criterion not indigenous to the nature of the writing itself. Many of them fade away when one understands the literary character and milieu of the book, including the various traditions which the author knew and utilized. Thus the unity of *Jonah*, minus the Psalm, seems assured.

---

[1] Thus Nowack marks them in his translation of *Jonah* (*op. cit.*, p. 200).

[2] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 61. [3] Riessler, *op. cit.*, p. 162.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 164. [5] Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

[6] Sievers, *op. cit.*, p. 45. [7] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

B. Date

The date of the book of *Jonah*[1] is difficult to determine. Unlike most prophetic literature this narrative does not specify a particular historical setting. It has no superscription locating the story in the reigns of kings of Israel and Judah,[2] or in the exilic[3] or post-exilic periods.[4] Neither does the tale contain explicit references to known historical events. On the basis of II Kings 14:25ff, Jonah, the son of Amittai, can be placed in the eighth century B.C. during the early years of the reign of Jeroboam II (i.e., 750 B.C.), but the age of this historical prophet is not necessarily the date of the story about him. His historical period only provides the *terminus a quo* for our book. A *terminus ad quem* is six centuries later when Jesus ben Sirach speaks of the "twelve prophets" (49:10). By 180 B.C., then, *Jonah* is a part of the prophetic canon.[5]

1. Survey of Critical Opinions

Clearly the question of date is unsettled. Critical opinions range all the way from the eighth to the second centuries B.C.[1] In pre-exilic times several periods have been proposed: (1) the first half of the eighth century, the time of the historical Jonah.[2] This date is frequently based on the assumption that Jonah himself is the author of the story, even though this claim is nowhere made or even suggested in the book itself. The narrative is about Jonah; it is not by him; (2) Goldhorn[3] argues for a date soon after the Assyrian destruction of Israel in 721 B.C. on the basis that the message of God's love for Nineveh would be appropriate only during this period; (3) A variation of this argument is the contention that the story of Jonah would have no meaning after the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C. Similarly, it would have no meaning in the prophet's own era since Nineveh was not then important in the history of Israel. Ergo, the book must have been composed sometime in the seventh century;[4] (4) A date in the seventh century is pinpointed more precisely by Rosenmüller and Bertholdt, who maintain that Jonah was written during the reign of Josiah.[1]

---

[1] Since we do not consider the Psalm an original part of *Jonah*, from here on our use of the phrase "book of *Jonah*" refers solely to the prose narrative.

[2] Cf., e.g., Hos. 1:1; Amos 1:1.

[3] Cf., e.g., Ezekiel 1:1ff.

[4] Cf., e.g., Haggai 1:1; Zech. 1:1.

[5] This date is taken from A. Jeffery, "The Canon of the OT," *IB* I, p. 35.

---

[1] We shall present only a summary of the various critical positions. The problem of date has been thoroughly discussed by many critics. Since this material is readily available, there is no need to re-work it here in detail. Wherever the name of a scholar appears with no further documentation given, the reference intended is to the work of that critic which has already been cited supra.

[2] Newcombe even suggests the 9th century as a possibility; he claims that Jonah is the earliest of the Twelve, having been written "between 823 and 783" (op. cit., p. xliii). Others who argue for an 8th century date include John Kennedy; Y. Kaufmann; E. B. Pusey (The Minor Prophets, I, p. 373ff); C. F. Keil (The Twelve Minor Prophets, I, p. 380ff).

[3] J. D. Goldhorn, Exkurse zum Buche Jonas. This work is unavailable to the writer. It is cited in discussions of date by L. Bertholdt and by Paul Kleinert (see infra). See also Kalisch, Book of Jonah, p. 230.

[4] B. D. Eerdmans, The Religion of Israel, pp. 175-177. F. Dijkema, "Het boek Jona," Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift 25 (1936), pp. 338-347. A summary of this article is given by Georg Fohrer, "Neuere Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie," TR 19 (1951), 315.

Several sixth century dates have also been proposed. Schmidt[2] suggests the early part of this century, *i.e.*, before the Exile. Jäger[3] and Kleinert[4] propose the time of the Exile (587-536). Orelli[5] places the composition in either the end of the Babylonian era or the beginning of the Persian period (late sixth century). Bleek[6] definitely prefers the latter period.[7]

The majority of scholars maintain that *Jonah* is not to be dated before the fifth century B.C. Many of these critics find it difficult to determine the precise post-exilic century to which the book belongs and hence are content simply to call it "late."[8] Others are more specific. A fifth century date is given by S. R. Driver, Cheyne, Cohen, Gaster,

---

[1] E. F. C. Rosenmüller, *Prophetae Minores*, 1827, pp. 344-347. L. Bertholdt, *Einleitung*, 5 (1815), pp. 2400-2406.

[2] H. Schmidt, "Absicht und Entstehungszeit des Buches Jona," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (1906), p. 180.

[3] G. F. Jäger, "Über den sittlich-reliogiösen Endzweck des Buches Jona," Tübingen *Zeitschrift für Theologie*, I, 1840, pp. 61-167. This reference is unavailable to the writer; for summaries of it, see *infra* Kleinert and Bleek.

[4] Kleinert, "The Book of Jonah," pp. 11, 14.

[5] Orelli, *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, p. 168.

[6] Bleek, *An Introduction to the OT*, p. 188; also Kalisch, *op. cit.*, pp. 222, 230.

[7] Ewald (*op. cit.*, p. 95) and Strack (*Einleitung*, p. 113) vacillate between a late sixth and early fifth century date.

[8] See, *inter alia*, Cook, Nötscher, Bentzen, Kuhl, König, Farrar, Kuenen, Nöldeke, Schrader, Reuss, Nowack, Bewer, Coppens, Riessler, Eissfeldt. See also Steuernagel (*Einleitung*, p. 442) and De Wette (*Einleitung*, p. 454). Weiser suggests between the 5th and 2nd centuries; Gray between 450-250; Kautzsch and Bertholet between 400-200 (*Die Heilige Schrift*, p. 50); Brockington ("Jonah," *Peake's Commentary*, p. 627) "between the end of the Exile and 200 B.C.," perhaps the time of Ezra-Nehemiah.

Bleeker, and Delcor.[1] Late fifth or early fourth is proposed by Budde, Sellin, and T. H. Robinson.[2] The fourth century is frequently suggested as the period of composition.[3] Marti and Hanson fluctuate between the fourth and the third centuries. Eiselen and Horton definitely place Jonah in the third century.[4] At least one scholar, namely Hitzig, dates the composition of Jonah in the Maccabean era (c 163-63 B.C.)[5] This second century date can be ruled out altogether, since the prophetic canon itself was fixed by c 200 B.C.[6], and since Jonah itself is referred to in literature which pre-dates the Maccabean Period: Ecclesiasticus 49:10 (c 180 B.C.) and Tobit 14:4 (c 200 B.C.).[7]

Regardless of the particular century in which Jonah is placed, from the fifth through the third, the arguments for a post-exilic date are much the same throughout. They may be summarized as follows:[8]

1) Jonah evinces a reliance upon other OT literature, viz. the Elijah and Elisha stories (I Kgs. 19:4-5); Jeremiah (18:11; 26:3,15);

---

[1] See also Feuillet; Smart (5th century or later).

[2] See now Dummelow, Lippl, Komlós.

[3] See, inter alia, G. F. Moore (after Alexander); Cornill (end of Persian or beginning of Greek period); Lanchester (c 300 B.C.); Wade ("perhaps" the 4th). See also G. A. Smith, Evans, Sellin-Rost, Henshaw, Paterson, Pfeiffer, Procksch, G. W. Anderson, and Wolff.

[4] See also W. Vatke, Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 688; K. Budde, Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur, pp. 214-218; A. R. Gordon, The Prophets of the OT, p. 350; Wellhausen: "by the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.," p. 211.

[5] F. Hitzig, "Des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab," pp. 36-39.

[6] Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 61.

[7] The date of Tobit according to C. C. Torrey, Apocryphal Literature, p. 85.

[8] This is a composite listing of the reasons most frequently cited.

Ezekiel (34:6; 27:8,9,25-29); and Joel (1:13, 2:13-14).[1] Such literary affinities between *Jonah* and the rest of the OT indicate that our little book is dependent upon these writings and hence post-dates them. Above all, its dependence upon Joel argues for a late date.[2]

2) *Jonah* manifests a developed theology which only evolved late in Israel's history. Its emphasis upon the universality of Yahweh's love bespeaks the influence of Second Isaiah.[3] Moreover, the issue of nationalism versus universalism fits the context of post-exilic times, especially the period of Ezra-Nehemiah.[4]

3) The vocabulary of *Jonah* is full of Aramaisms, of words found only in late Hebrew literature, and of expressions characteristic of post-exilic times.[5] These linguistic features point to a late date:

Aramaisms:[6] מלח (1:5); ספינה (1:5);
עשת (1:6); בשלמי (1:7); טעם (3:7);
רבו (4:11); and possibly מנה (2:1; 4:6,7,8).

---

[1] For statements of this argument, see Driver, *op. cit.*, pp. 322-323n; Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 588; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 12: Cornill, *op. cit.*, p. 337 (English), 209 (German). A most thorough analysis of biblical sources for *Jonah* has been done by A. Feuillet, "Les Sources du Livre de Jonas," *RB 54 (1947)*, 161-186.

[2] This statement assumes a post-exilic date for Joel, most likely fourth century; see Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 575f.

[3] See, e.g., Procksch, *op. cit.*, p. 90; Sellin, *Introduction*, p. 173; Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 873; Weiser, *Einleitung*, p. 203.

[4] See, e.g., T. H. Robinson, *Die Zwolf...*, p. 119; von Baudissin, *Einleitung*, p. 599; Feuillet, "Le Sens...," pp. 349-350.

[5] See, e.g., Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 873; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Weiser, *The OT*, p. 251; Oesterley and Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 372ff; Rinaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

[6] We present here the words given by E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*.

Late Hebrew Words: קריאה (3:2); שתק (1:11);
עמל (4:10); possibly מנה .

Late Hebrew Expressions:

"God of the heavens" (1:9)[1] Cf. Jer. 18:7-8; 51:34,44; Joel 2:13,14; Ez. 1:2; 6:9; Neh. 1:4,5; Dan. 2:18; 4:34, *etc*.

"son of the night" (4:10)[2]

4) It has been argued that the legendary description of Nineveh in *Jonah* shows that this story was composed sometime after the existence of the historical city.[3] Sufficient time has lapsed after the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C. for our author to utilize his imagination in looking back upon the city. In 3:3 he clearly refers to Nineveh in the past tense. If the mention of 120,000 people in 4:10-11 refers only to children, as many commentators hold,[4] then undoubtably the population of this Nineveh is historically impossible; the size of the city has been greatly exaggerated. Moreover, the title "king of Nineveh" is not historically accurate. Such a title never appears in Assyrian annals. Sayce maintains that it could never have been used while the Assyrian Empire was in existence.[5] The additional fact that this king is unnamed shows that we are dealing with a legendary motif and with an age long after the existence of the Assyrian Empire.

---

[1] See Köhler, *Theology*, p. 239, n 10; Chary, *Les Prophètes et le Culte*, p. 181; Rinaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

[2] See Oesterley and Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 373f.

[3] See, e.g., Sellin, *Introduction*, p. 173; Nowack, *op. cit.*, p. 189; Smart, *op. cit.*, p. 873; Delcor, *op. cit.*, p. 266f; Budde, *JE*, p. 228; Bentzen, II, p. 145.

[4] See our remarks on this matter in Chapter III.

[5] A. H. Sayce, *The "Higher Criticism" and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 487ff.

5) The literary form of *Jonah* may point to the post-exilic era. Some scholars maintain that the *Gattung* is akin to rabbinic midrashim and that this genre speaks for a late date.[1]

2. Evaluation of the Evidence

These arguments for a post-exilic date are not all of equal merit. The first two are questionable criteria for use in dating literature. An argument based on literary affinities is never decisive. From the observation that *Jonah* is similar to or identical with given OT passages, it does not necessarily follow that *Jonah* is dependent upon this literature and hence late. For instance, on the basis of the fact that Jon. 4:2b is like Joel 2:3 it cannot be established that *Jonah* is therefore borrowing from Joel. One might argue just as well that Joel is dependent upon *Jonah*, or that these two borrowed from a third writer, or that the similarities between them exist independently and show only a general milieu of thinking in ancient Israel. In other words, literary similarities do not prove sources[2] and hence cannot be employed as reliable criteria for dating. Since literary affinities may be accounted for in various ways, their value as an argument for the dating of *Jonah*, early or late, is to be minimized.

The same criticism applies to theological reasons which are advanced to establish the date of a document, especially when they presuppose a theory of progressive revelation. Such reasons, which were much used by the Wellhausenian school in dating the sources of the Pentateuch, are today increasingly recognized as invalid. The OT itself denies a scheme of progressive revelation from lower to higher "ideas."[1] In Israel's history low and high "theologies" exist side by side. The fact that Jonah may breathe a spirit of universalism is no sign that the book is late. One can find similar expressions of Yahweh's concern for foreigners in the Elijah and Elisha narratives (I Kgs. 17:8ff; II Kgs. 4:11ff; 5:1ff) and in the J document (Gen. 12:13; 18:16-33).[2] Moreover, the contention that Jonah was influenced by Second Isaiah is not at all certain. Just because the little book shares some themes with Second Isaiah does not mean that it is dependent upon that prophet.[3] In this connection it may be pointed out that the so-called universalism of Jonah differs considerably from that of the Unknown Prophet. While the latter reiterates again and again the aloneness and oneness of Yahweh and explicitly denies the existence of other deities (e.g., Isa. 43:10-13; 44:6,9ff; 45:14;46:9, etc.), the author of Jonah shows no acquaintance with this way of thinking. Clearly he does not deny the existence of other gods (1:5); he delivers no polemic against idolatry; and he does not attempt to have Nineveh converted to a monotheistic faith in Yahweh; he is not really concerned with the issue of monotheism. It is precisely on the basis of such observations as these that some scholars[1] have used the theological argument to date Jonah as early literature; they maintain that its view of God is not advanced enough for the post-exilic age and that its spirit of love and mercy does not fit the Restoration Period. From all this, the arbitrariness of a theological criterion for dating becomes apparent. This arbitrariness is also present in the view which holds that the story is late because its message best fits the historical situation of Ezra-Nehemiah. To argue thus is to impose from the outside an historical and theological context upon the book. One might equally aver, as do Eerdmans and Dijkema, that the message of the book fits best the historical situation of the seventh century. In other words, to attempt to date Jonah on the basis of its theology or of its meaning is an unreliable procedure. Like arguments based on literary affinities, arguments from theology are not decisive in establishing the date of our book.

---

[1] K. Budde, *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur*, p. 216; Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, p. 442; Coppens, "Les Douze Petits Prophètes," p. 29; O. Loretz, "Herkunft und Sinn der Jona-Erzählung," BZ 5 (Jan. 1961), 27f.

[2] See Trepanier's criticism of Feuillet on precisely this point, "The Story of Jonas," CBQ 13 (1951), 15; see also Loretz, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

---

[1] For discussions of this matter, see G. E. Wright, The OT Against Its Environment, pp. 9-16; ibid., God Who Acts, pp. 33-35.

[2] Cf. Eichrodt, Theology of the OT I, pp. 220-227, esp. p. 224.

[3] Cf. the remark of T. J. Meek in a discussion of the relationship between Hebrew monotheism and the religion of Akhenaten of Egypt: "Similarity or even identity of ideas does not necessarily imply borrowing" (Hebrew Origins, p. 226).

Linguistic evidence is more valuable in determining the date of composition then are literary and theological reasons. In the light of recent discoveries and studies, some of the linguistic arguments for dating Jonah in post-exilic times require modification and/or correction. First, the term "Aramaisms" must be employed cautiously and sparingly. Heretofore many terms not common in biblical Hebrew were ascribed to Aramaic influences upon the biblical language and accordingly viewed as signs of late dating.[2] Yet it is now known that Aramaic, like Hebrew, is but one dialect of Northwest Semitic, and that many words once thought to be Aramaisms are in reality pure Canaanite or Phoenician words of sometimes ancient origins.[1] Thus the term "Aramaisms" may not only be misleading but even inaccurate.

---

[1] E.g., K. Kohler, op. cit., p. 139; Kaufmann, op. cit., pp. 282-284.

[2] N. H. Snaith, "Language of the OT," IB I, p. 223. Aramaic was strongest in influence during the sixth to the fourth centuries B.C.; see S. Moscati, Ancient Semitic Civilizations, p. 172; D. Harden, The Phoenicians, p. 56.

In *Jonah*, O. Loretz[2] has demonstrated that the words ש , רבו , מלח , בשלמי and ספינה are not Aramaisms but rather belong to a north Israelite-Phoenician vocabulary.[3] They do not indicate a late date for *Jonah*; instead they may testify to possibly early linguistic influences in the tale.

A similar statement can be made for some of the so-called late Hebrew words and expressions in the book. The root מנה is attested in Ugaritic,[4] even though the Piel of this verb occurs only in late biblical passages (e.g., Dan. 1:5,10f; I Chron. 9:29; the Aramaic Ez. 7:25; Dan. 2:24,49). The phrase "God of the heavens" cannot be used as a sure sign of a late date for *Jonah*. Although the phrase does appear most often in post-exilic literature, particularly in the Persian period,[5] it is also found in the J document (Gen. 24:3,7). Interestingly, in Jonah this phrase occurs in a confession containing the archaistic word Hebrew, which occurs primarily in J and E.[1] One may wonder, then, if this entire confession is not an archaism embedded in the story? At any rate, "God of the heavens" is not a certain sign of late composition.

---

[1] A. M. Honeyman, "Hebrew Philology," *OTMS*, p. 278; cf. Harden, *op. cit.*, p. 116ff.

[2] O. Loretz, "Herkunft und Sinn der Jona-Erzählung," BZ 5 (Jan. 1961), 18-29. This article contains full documentation and bibliography. Among the works cited there, see esp. Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, pp. 54,55,63f,117,127,145,146,148; C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual* I 7, p. 35; M. J. Dahood, "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth," *Biblica* 33 (1952), 44-45. G. Bergstrasser, "Das Hebräische Präfix ש- " *ZAW* 29 (1909), 40-56.

[3] M. D. Goldman's hypothesis that *Jonah* was originally written in Aramaic and later translated into Hebrew is to be rejected *in toto* ("Was the Book of Jonah Originally Written in Aramaic?" *Australian Biblical Review*, III, Nos. 1-4 (March/December 1953), 49f).

[4] K-B, p. 536; Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual*.

[5] See, e.g., the passages cited *supra*; see also A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.*, pp. 99, 111, 113, 119, 123, 135, 139.

The above observations show that the linguistic material for a post-exilic date is not as extensive as many critics have claimed. Peculiarities in the language of Jonah do not always point to late biblical or Aramaic influences; some may well be remnants of an early north Israelite dialect which has survived only sparsely in the OT.[2] Nevertheless, after such words are removed from consideration, there yet remains linguistic evidence for a late date. Until discoveries and/or analyses show otherwise, words like טעם, עשת, קריאה, עמל, and שתק still indicate a post-exilic date for our booklet. Particularly noteworthy is the term טעם. It is used in 3:7 in its technical sense as a royal edict.[3] Even conservative scholars, who wish to date Jonah in pre-exilic times, recognize the difficulty of accounting for this term in Hebrew literature prior to the post-exilic era.[4] On the whole, then, a part of the vocabulary of Jonah does suggest a post-exilic time of composition.

---

[1] See BDB, p. 720; cf. J. Bright, A History of Israel, p. 84.

[2] Cf. Driver, Introduction, pp. 322, 188n.

[3] Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 35, explains the term as most likely a Babylonian-Assyrian loanword taken over into Aramaic. In its technical sense, it is found in the OT only in Jonah 3:7 and in Aramaic passages (Dan. 3:10; 4:8f;17; Ezr. 6:14; 7:23).

[4] See, e.g., Pusey, op. cit., p. 375 and Keil, The Twelve Prophets, p. 381. Both men admit that ta'am is a non-Hebrew word; they claim Jonah heard it while he was in Nineveh and then transferred it to his story! See also Aalders, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

Akin to this linguistic evidence is an orthographic consideration. A. Murtonen claims that the text of Jonah employs the vowel-consonants more than any other book among the Twelve.[1] If it be correct that the use of matres lectionis increases from older to younger writings,[2] then this fact definitely supports a late date for Jonah.

The fourth argument proposed for a late date centers upon the legendary description of the city Nineveh. This argument seems cogent. Jonah is not concerned with the historical Nineveh. The author draws upon memories of that once colossal place in order to portray a type of ancient city. It is not essential for the historical Nineveh to exist. Quite the contrary. This story could hardly have been written while Nineveh was an historical reality. The writer knows of a city which was in the past very great (3:3).[3] To this knowledge he adds imagination and thereby creates a legendary Nineveh. Surely this portrayal of Nineveh speaks for a time of composition long after 612 B.C.

The final argument, based on an analysis of literary genre, may also be of use in dating Jonah. If it can be demonstrated that this little book exhibits the characteristics of Jewish literature in a post-exilic era, then this fact would support a late dating. One must show caution in limiting a given Gattung to certain eras; yet in relationship to the category of midrash the argument here is not without force.[1]

---

[1] A. Murtonen, "The Fixation in Writing of Various Parts of the Pentateuch," VT III, 1953, p. 46. Murtonen does not give the methods and details of his research.

[2] See references cited by Murtonen; see also Roberts, op. cit., p. 16.

[3] On the use and meaning of the verb hayah here, including its possible parallel to the form in Gen. 1:2, see Kalisch, op. cit., pp. 222-223; 232-233. Cf. J. Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Language, p. 59.

3. Conclusion

In our efforts to date Jonah we have eliminated, as more or less unreliable, criteria based on literary affinities and on message or theology. These arguments tend to be arbitrary and thus of little real use. As for the argument based on literary genre, we are not able at this point to assess its strength; hence, we remove it temporarily from consideration. The two remaining arguments do yield material on the basis of which one can make judgments about the time of the composition of our story. The book contains some words characteristic of a north Israelite-Phoenician dialect, and these may be of ancient origins. On the other hand, there are words which can only be accounted for, so far as we now know, in terms of the post-exilic era. This latter linguistic evidence indicates that the book cannot have been composed before the fifth century B.C. The legendary portrayal of Nineveh supports this dating; the historical city lies in the distant past.

In conclusion we repeat our introductory remarks about the difficulty of determining the date of Jonah. The lack of concreteness in the book and the sparseness of specific historical allusions testify to this difficulty. All in all, however, a date in the fifth (or possibly fourth) century B.C. is feasible. Surely the burden of proof lies upon him who would place the composition before this time.

C. Provenance

This topic has received little attention in the literature on Jonah.

---

[1] See the relevant comments in our discussion of Jonah as a midrash in Chapter III.

Much like the issue of date, the question of provenance is difficult to answer. The author does not tell us where he composed. Yet certain clues are given which make it possible to comment upon the origin of the story, if not upon the locale of the story-teller.

In the nineteenth century Hitzig argued that *Jonah* had been written in Egypt;[1] in the twentieth century this view has been echoed by C. S. Knopf.[2] Hitzig advanced three reasons for the choice of this particular site: (1) The fabulous character of the story, as well as its adventurous spirit, fits the mentality of Egypt, "the land of wonder." (2) The atmospheric conditions described by the word חרישית (4:8) would be readily comprehensible to Egyptians. (3) The hapax קיקיון (4:6) is an Egyptian word.

Singularly and collectively these reasons are inconclusive. In the first place, wonder-literature was by no means confined to ancient Egypt. To be sure, this country may have excelled in producing such stories, but even a rambling sample of the literature of the ancient Near East shows plainly the international character and scope of wonder-stories.[3] Egypt had no monopoly on them; they were cosmopolitan in origin and in distribution. In terms of its fabulous character the book of *Jonah* is at home almost anywhere in the ancient world. The word חרישית , upon which Hitzig bases his second reason , is impossible to translate; its meaning is not known.[4] Even if we accept the frequent rendering of "sultry," that which is described in the total phrase, "sultry east wind," is not a phenomenon unique to Egypt. It is a description of the desert sirocco, that destructive wind well known and dreaded by the inhabitants of Palestine.[1] Thus, there is nothing decidedly Egyptian about the atmospheric conditions described in 4:8. Hitzig's third argument, based on an Egyptian etymology for קיקיון, is not reliable. There is also evidence of an Akkadian root for this word.[2] All in all, then, these arguments for an Egyptian provenance of Jonah are not convincing.[3]

---

[1] F. Hitzig, "Des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab," 1831; *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, 1863, p. 162.

[2] C. S. Knopf, *The Old Testament Speaks*, 1946, p. 334.

[3] Cf., e.g., the specimens given in ANET.

[4] See Weiser, ATD, p. 224; see also remarks *ad loc.* in Chapter I.

Palestine has also been suggested as the place of the origin of Jonah. In favor of this site two explicit references in the story itself may be adduced: (1) the seaport of Joppa (1:2) from which Jonah leaves to flee to Tarshish; (2) the words "my country" in 4:2, which, if read historically, refer to northern Israel from which the historical Jonah came (II Kgs. 14:25).

It is the first of these references which prompted Kalisch to assume that Jonah was possibly a product of southern Palestine. He reasoned that since Joppa was the harbor closest to Jerusalem, the capital of Judah, our author probably wrote in Jerusalem.[4] Yet the reasoning is questionable;

---

[1] For a description, see D. Baly, The Geography of the Bible, pp. 67-70.

[2] BDB, p. 884; KB, p. 838.

[3] Equally untenable is Goldhorn's view that Jonah was composed in Assyria by a Hebrew exile. This claim is based on an interpretation of the book as an attempt to persuade Assyria to deal gently with conquered Israel (Kalisch, op. cit., p. 230, 266). Also dubious is Jäger's argument for a Babylonian provenance on the assumption that Nineveh is a covering-name for Babylonia. He interprets the story as an explanation of why Babylonia was not destroyed when captured by the Persians (Bleek, op. cit., p. 188; P.Friedrichsen, Kritische Uebersicht, p. 144ff.). Such attempts to identify the provenance of Jonah have little to commend them.

[4] Kalisch, op. cit., p. 138. Bleek also holds for a Judean provenance but does not give his reasons (op. cit., p. 188).

at any rate it does not establish the origin of our story. Joppa was not a part of the Kingdom of Judah.[1] Centrally located on the coast of Palestine, it was as available and familiar to the North as to the South. In fact, this port was used by seafaring Phoenicians and may have been under their control (cf. II Chron. 2:16; Ezr. 3:7).[2] On the basis of the proximity of Joppa to Jerusalem we can draw no conclusions about an origin for *Jonah* in southern Palestine. On the other hand, the weight of evidence decidedly supports a *northern* provenance:

1) Certain linguistic peculiarities in *Jonah* are characteristic of north Israelite-Phoenician speech.[3]

2) The historical prophet Jonah was a citizen of the Northern Kingdom in the first half of the eighth century B.C. He was from Gath-heper, a town located about 15 miles west of the Sea of Chinnereth;[4] earlier it had belonged to the tribal territory of Zebulon (Josh. 19:10,13). Jonah came from northern Israel, and he prophesied in that Kingdom. This northern prophet supplies the historical nucleus for our tale.[5]

3) The fact that Nineveh is the foreign city featured in *Jonah* may

---

[1] See *Joppa* on maps I, IV-VII, and XI in J. Bright, *op. cit.* In the days of the Judges, Joppa may have been a part of the territory of Dan, but the evidence is inconclusive (J. Simon, *Geographical and Topographical Texts*, p. 202). Not until the time of Simon Maccabeus did the Jews actually control this seaport (I Macc. 14:5; Noth, *The History of Israel*, pp. 377-378).

[2] E. G. Kraeling, *Bible Atlas*, pp. 32, 419; Mazar, ed., *Views of the Biblical World*, p. 251; D. Harden, *The Phoenicians*, pp. 25, 121, 219 (n 7). Cf. also the reference to Joppa in the Taylor Prism (D. W. Thomas, *Documents from OT Times*, p. 66).

[3] See our discussion on Date; see esp. Loretz, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

[4] See map on p. 42 of Wright and Filson, *Historical Atlas*.

[5] Cf. M. Buber, *The Prophetic Faith*, p. 104.

8

be another indication that we have here north Israelite traditions. Certainly Israel felt the brutality and power of Assyria in her history more intensely than did southern Judah. By the hands of Assyria Israel was totally destroyed (721 B.C.). Accordingly, the capital city Nineveh would have played no small role in the thinking of the North; for Israel she was the foreign city par excellence. Hence, the use of Nineveh in our story again points to a north Israel milieu.[1]

4) Another sign that Jonah originated in the North is suggested by the tale of the sea in Chapter 1. As is well known, the Hebrews themselves had little or no contact with or knowledge of the sea.[2] It is singularly noteworthy that one whole section of Jonah should be concerned in some detail with sea-going activities (e.g., throwing wares overboard (1:5) and "digging" to return to shore (1:13)). Information for this scene must have been derived from other than strictly Hebrew traditions.[3] Since the language of Jonah definitely leads us to north Israelite-Phoenician territory, it is also entirely possible that the tale of the sea may have come into Israel from Phoenician contacts. At least our author has obtained a large portion of his material from a locale where sea-going adventures and Israelite-Phoenician linguistic peculiarities were both present.

Linguistic peculiarities, the use of the prophet Jonah, of the city Nineveh, and of a sea-faring tale - all these features lead us to seek the provenance of Jonah in northern Palestine.

---

[1] Cf. Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., p. 376.

[2] Noth, The History of Israel, p. 13.

[3] Loretz, op. cit., esp. p. 24.

Conclusions

Our literary-historical investigations of Jonah have resulted in these three conclusions: (1) The prose narrative of the book is a unit; the Psalm of Chapter 2 is an insertion. (2) The prose narrative was composed in post-exilic times, perhaps in the fifth or fourth centuries B.C. (3) The provenance of the narrative is probably northern Palestine.

CHAPTER III

FORM CRITICAL STUDIES

From an analysis of composition one moves to a consideration of form critical issues. In the preceding chapter we established the limits of the literary unit of *Jonah*; now it is necessary to discover what kind or type of material this unit is, what its literary characteristics are, and how it was used in ancient Israel.

A. The Task of Form Criticism

1. Nature and Purpose

To Hermann Gunkel scholarship is principally indebted for the development of the form critical approach to the Bible.[1] Gunkel contended that in order to understand the OT one must go behind the documents as we now have them and also behind their possible written sources to take account of their formations in oral traditions. The historical-critical approach is alone insufficient since it concerns itself only with the analysis of written materials and not with their oral sources. Yet it is precisely in the stages of oral transmission that Hebrew literature was fashioned into various forms. These forms (*Gattungen*) Gunkel proceeded to describe and to classify. He maintained that they exhibit definite and distinct literary characteristics which must be studied scientifically and systematically.[1] Important also in Formgeschichte is the Sitz im Leben of a given type - the conditions or situations in the life of the people which helped to produce it and to preserve it. A concern with Sitz im Leben is a concern with the use of traditions in the religion of Israel. Finally, Gunkel was interested in affinities between a given unit and all other units of that same type.

---

[1] Gunkel laid down the principles of this approach in *Die Genesis*, (Handkommentar zum AT), Div., I, Vol. I. See also his "Die israelitsche Literatur" in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I, 7, pp. 51-102; "Sagen und Legenden II. In Israel." RGG^1 V, col. 49ff. Summaries of the work and the contributions of Gunkel may be found in the following: G. E. Wright, "The Study of the OT," *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*, p. 27ff; Hahn, "Form Criticism and the Old Testament," *Old Testament in Modern Research*, p. 119ff; Bentzen, *Introduction*, I, p. 13f and p. 108ff; A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," OTMS, pp. 162-209; James Muilenburg, "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: "The Gains of Form Criticism in OT Studies," *The Expository Times*, LXXI, No. 8 (May, 1960), 229-233; E. T. Ryder, "Form Criticism of the Old Testament," *Peake's Commentary*, pp. 91-95.

Gattungskritik does not purport to approach literature primarily in terms of its content.[2] To begin with a consideration of content is methodologically unsound and may result in unnecessary confusion of types. While the content of a piece cannot be ignored, it does not per se determine the form of that unit. The relationship between the two properties is rather the reverse: it is the proper classification of form which yields the proper understanding of content. The former must be correctly articulated if the latter is to be correctly apprehended. A correct analysis of types centers upon such criteria as the sphere of life in which the literature appears, the way in which it is used, and the style in which it is clothed.[3]

Motivating form critical studies of the Bible for Gunkel was an appreciation for the beauty and charm of literary creations. We must not assume, however, that the Hebrews themselves created forms out of a literary interest. It was not aesthetics but custom and convention which determined form.[1] One spoke in a certain way because of the occasion which gave rise to his speech. Thus both the purpose and the results of our task move beyond aesthetic concerns to matters of interpretation. Form embodies meaning. "Careful literary analysis and rhetorical articulation often disclose in a startling way the interior fabric of the thought."[2]

---

[1] H. Gunkel, What Remains of the OT, p. 60f; also "Die israelitische Literatur," op. cit.

[2] Bentzen, op. cit., I, pp. 108-110.

[3] Idem. Cf. S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 42f.

2. Difficulties

Unfortunately not all biblical scholars have recognized the need and the value of form critical studies.[3] Those who do employ the discipline[4] vary in their understanding of it, specifically in their choice and use of terminology. There seems to be no standard nomenclature accepted by those working in this field.[5] One may find different terms used for the same literary type or, conversely, the same term used for different types. An ambiguity is also present in such terms as Myth and Midrash which may be used both to designate literary forms and to convey religious interpretation. In spite of the fact that Gattungskritik is an analysis of form, some of the suggested categories are actually characterizations of content. An example is the category of Fable to designate stories about animals and/or plants. Thus in this matter of the choice and use of Gattungen, even the over-all appropriateness and validity of some of the categories may be challenged.[1] Such confusion in nomenclature may also reflect more basic and serious confusion in methodology. While in theory the classification of literature is based upon an examination of form which in turn reveals the proper understanding of content, in actuality the form seems at times to have been determined by the criterion of content. In other words, the relationship between form and content is not always understood or properly appropriated by scholars.[2] Nor is this relationship totally clear in the canons of the discipline itself.

---

[1] Muilenburg, The Way of Israel, p. 29.

[2] Muilenburg, "The Gains of Form Criticism," p. 232.

[3] This statement applies especially to the American and British scenes; see Muilenburg, "The Gains of Form Criticism," p. 230.

[4] For discussions of Gattungskritik see Bentzen, op. cit., I, pp. 102-264; Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 8-137; Weiser, The OT, pp. 21-68; Muilenburg, The Way of Israel, pp. 24-30.

[5] For a recent attempt to correct this difficulty, see Claus Westermann, Grundformen Prophetischer Rede (1960). Westermann surveys the research done in this area since 1900 and then offers a classification of the forms of speech (Redeformen) in the prophetic books under three main headings:

In several respects then a form critical approach to the OT is fraught with difficulties. When properly used, however, the method can and does yield fruitful results for an understanding of biblical literature and faith.[3] What has been generally observed thus far about the values and

---

(1) Reports; (2) Words of prophecy; (3) Words directed by man to God. He observes that the distribution of these forms in the prophetic books varies considerably. For his specific comments on Jonah, see infra.

[1] Carl A. Keller observes that the Gattungen employed by Gunkel for OT literature are actually German literary types; they are foreign designations which have been imposed upon ancient oriental literature. Keller claims that whereas distinct literary types may have existed in the poetry of ancient Israel (e.g., tephilloth and tehillim), it is unlikely that the Hebrews recognized different types of narratives. All narratives, if given any designations, were simply called dabar. Hence, Keller holds that the attempt to classify OT narratives into specific literary forms is highly questionable, if not invalid. His alternative is to search for the motifs within narratives. See "Die Gefährdung der Ahnfrau: Ein Beitrag zur gattungs-und motivgeschichtlichen Erforschung alttestamentlicher Erzählungen," ZAW 66 (1954), 181-191.

[2] A case in point is Eiselen's discussion of the Gattung of Jonah. Eiselen considers literary form after he has already expounded at length on the meaning of the story. He sees no vital connection between form and content when he says, "Whatever may be the final conclusion regarding the type of literature to which the little book belongs, the significance of its teaching is in no wise affected by the diversity of opinion." (The Prophetic Books of the OT, p. 459f). Cf. also A. Cohen, The Twelve Prophets, p. 137.

[3] Muilenburg, "The Gains of Form Criticism," pp. 230-233.

limitations of this approach will become evident in our study of Jonah.

B. Gattung

1. Introduction

Perhaps the single issue on which Jonah scholarship agrees unanimously is the uniqueness of the Gattung of this book among the Latter Prophets.[1] Only with Haggai does Jonah share the distinction of being completely a prose work. Alone it stands as an entire book of prophecy in narrative-form.[2] If the narrative is indeed "the most representative and characteristic mode of biblical speech,"[3] at the same time it is most certainly not a characteristic form for the Latter Prophets.[4] Thus it can be averred that Jonah is both an ordinary and a distinctive type, both a usual and unusual specimen of Hebrew literature.

With the exception of five words of doom in 3:4, Jonah contains no prophetic utterances. It has no oracles, sermons, visions, or predictions addressed to Israel or to the nations. The uniqueness of its narrative form among the Latter Prophets bespeaks the uniqueness of its contents. Instead of the words of Yahweh delivered through his servant the prophet, we have an account about a rebellious prophet who himself hurled words of accusation at Yahweh.

---

[1] This statement is so commonplace in the literature on Jonah that specific documentation is superfluous.

[2] Of the three kinds of Redeformen which Westermann identifies (see supra), only the first (Berichte) is to be found in Jonah. Moreover, of all the prophetic books, only Jonah consists exclusively in a report (Westermann, op. cit., p. 64).

[3] Muilenburg, The Way of Israel, p. 24.

[4] Possible parallels to the third person narrative form of Jonah may be found only in sections of other Latter Prophets. Cf., e.g., Isaiah 36-39; Amos 7:10-15; Hosea 1-3. On "Literary Forms of Prophetic Literature," see J. Muilenburg, "Old Testament Prophecy," Peake's Commentary, p. 477, esp. p. 478.

If there is complete agreement on the uniqueness of this narrative form, it is counterbalanced by a wide diversity of views about what type of narrative Jonah is. No fewer than ten different Gattungen have been applied to Jonah. This broad range of opinion points both to the lack of standard nomenclature and to the elusive character of this particular book.

2. Jonah as historical narrative

Before the advent of Higher Criticism commentators assumed that the Jonah narrative was historical, an accurate report of an actual event in the life of the prophet Jonah, son of Amittai. When this assumption became questionable, its adherents were called upon to substantiate it. For critics who wrote during the latter half of the nineteenth century the issue was indeed a live one. Among others, Stowe (1853), Keil (1873), Kleinert (1875), Pusey (1885), Orelli (1893), and John Kennedy (1895) each presented numerous arguments in support of the historicity of the narrative.[1] Apart from minor individual variations, their position may be summarized as follows: (1) Throughout the centuries Jewish and Christian traditions have assumed the historicity of Jonah. (2) The words of Jesus indicate that he considered the story historical (cf. Mtt. 12:39f; 16:4; Lk. 11:29-32). (3) In the eighth century B.C., a time when Assyria was a powerful threat to Israel, there did live in the Northern Kingdom a prophet named Jonah son of Amittai (II Kings 14:25). (4) Certain statements in *Jonah* can be corroborated historically.[1] (5) The central missionary aim of the prophecy is psychologically defeated unless the story actually happened. (6) Non-historical explanations are unsatisfactory; thus by default they testify to the historicity of the book.[2]

---

[1] C. E. Stowe, "The Prophet Jonah," BS X (Oct. 1853), 739-764. Keil, Introduction to OT, I, p. 395ff; Kleinert, "The Book of Jonah," p. 2f; Pusey, The Minor Prophets, p. 371ff; Orelli, The Twelve Minor Prophets, p. 172f; John Kennedy, On the Book of Jonah, pp. 20-97. See also Stuart Mitchell, Jonah (1875), pp. 27-31; T. T. Perowne, Jonah (1879), pp. 11-15, 59f.

It is unnecessary to evaluate at length the historical view of the *Gattung* of *Jonah*. That work has been done in detail by numerous scholars.[3] In summary we note only one positive contention in the historical argument: the account in II Kings 14:25 does provide a basis for identifying the prophet Jonah as a historical person. However, strong evidence militates against the historical character of the book itself. The many miraculous features of the story,[1] plus the lack of any biblical or extra-biblical confirmation of the events, vouch for a non-historical narrative. Strikingly absent from the tale is the historical mode of writing. We are not provided with such particulars as when the events took place, where Jonah was when Yahweh's call came, where Jonah was thrown up on land, what the particular sins of the Ninevites were, who the "king of Nineveh" was, how the episode ended, *etc*. These concrete forms of expression, which are an integral part of historiography, are lacking here.[2] The story begins *in medias res* and closes even more abruptly. These characteristics indicate that the interest and purpose of the author was not in reporting history.[3] Moreover, the symmetrical arrangement of the book tends to support this observation.[1] A literary piece so carefully and artistically constructed as Jonah is not a record of history.[2]

---

[1] Kleinert (*op. cit.*, p. 2) cites four examples: (1) Jonah's mission agrees with the historical circumstances of the eighth century B.C. (2) The size of Nineveh corresponds to the measurements given in Diodorus Siculus ii 3. (3) The book of Nahum attests the truth of Nineveh's corruption. (4) The mourning of cattle (Jon. 3:8) is confirmed as possible by Herodotus.

[2] Twentieth century statements of the historical view add nothing substantially new to these arguments. See the following: J. Döller, *Das Buch Jonas* (1912), esp. p. 30f; R. D. Wilson, "The Authenticity of Jonah," *PTR* 16 (1918), 280-298, 430-456; F. J. Lamb, "The Book of Jonah," BS 81 (April, 1924), 152-169; F. W. Mozley, "Proof of the Historical Truth of the Book of Jonah," *ibid.*, 170-200; V. Ermoni, "Jonas," *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (1926), cols. 1608-1609; A. J. Wilson, "The Sign of the Prophet Jonah," *PTR* (1927), 630-642; J. B. G. Pidge, *Jonah* (1935), p. viff; D. E. Hart-Davies, "The Book of Jonah in the Light of Assyrian Archaeology," *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* 69 (1937), 230-249; T. E. Bird, *The Book of Jona* (1938), pp. xxiii-xxix, xxxiii; Aalders, "The Book of Jonah," (1948), pp. 9-15, 27ff; E. J. Young, *Introduction* (1949), pp. 254-55; G. B. Stanton, "The Prophet Jonah and his Message," BS 108 (April-June,1961), 238-244; Trepanier, "The Story of Jonas," CBQ 13 (1951), 14-15; James Kennedy, *Studies in the Book of Jonah* (1956), p. 19f; M. R. De Haan, *Jonah: Fact or Fiction?* (1957), *passim*.

[3] For a point by point evaluation and refutation of the position of Keil in particular and of the historical interpretation in general, see Eiselen, *op. cit.*, p. 444ff. See also Farrar, *op. cit.*, pp. 233-236; Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 324; C. A. Briggs, "Works of Imagination in the Old Testament," *The North American Review* 164 (March, 1897), 362-365. For a discussion of the relationship between the words attributed to Jesus about *Jonah* and the results of Higher Criticism, see Hanson, *Jonah and Daniel*, p. 10ff.

---

[1] These miracles include the convenient timing and cessation of the storm at sea; the availability of a big fish at the proper moment; Jonah's survival in the fish for three days; the swift and complete conversion of an entire city; the quick appearance of a plant and a worm. On the accumulation of improbabilities, see Feuillet, "Le Livre de Jonas," p. 12; *ibid*., "Jonas," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, cols. 1114ff, and Delcor, "Jonas," p. 273.

Those who hold that *Jonah* is history deal with the problem of miracles. Some have attempted to rationalize the episode of the fish by citing historical parallels to the account (see Mozley, *op. cit*., and Ed König, "Jonah," DB, pp. 744-753). The fallacies of this effort are pointed out by Bewer (*op. cit*., p. 5f). G. Macloskie argues that a whale is physiologically structured so that it can safely house a man ("How to Test the Story of Jonah," BS 72 (April, 1915), 334-338. On this point, cf. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands*, pp. 199, 202. Other commentators take refuge in a doctrine of God's omnipotence. E.g., Orelli says that the story of the fish must be accepted as a miracle "fully justified on religious grounds"(*op. cit*., pp. 172f, 177).

[2] The failure to distinguish between *Historie* and *Geschichte* is characteristic of scholars who view *Jonah* as historical; cf., e.g., Aalders, who says that "...all parables resemble a record of historical events" (*op. cit*., p. 14). On the distinction between these terms, see von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 30f.

[3] Driver, *Introduction*, p. 324.

Apart from conservative scholarship today the question of the historical veracity of Jonah is not seriously considered. It seems no longer to be a major issue in the study of the book.[3] Suffice it to say that the Jonah narrative is not in the form of historiography and its contents are not to be interpreted historically.[4]

3. Jonah as non-historical narrative

Non-historical narrative types which have been applied to Jonah include: didactic fiction, tale, short story, satire, sermon, fable, myth, folk tale, allegory, parable, midrash, and legend. This multiplicity of types indicates that our task is not the search for possible Gattungen, but rather the analysis of these suggested forms with the hope of arriving at one or more which seem most appropriate.

a. General designations

Not all the proposals are of equal merit. Such terms as didactic fiction,[1] tale,[2] and short story[3] are inadequate because they are not precise formal categories. Their vagueness leads one to ask what kind of didactic fiction, tale, or short story *Jonah* is. The question "what kind of" is also applicable to the classification of *Jonah* as a satire,[4] a term which is perhaps more indicative of content and purpose than it is of form. Of a similar character is the use of the term sermon.[5] Sermon is a *Gattung* (cf. Jer. 7:1ff; Ez. 20), but *Jonah* is not specifically written in this form. The use of the category 'sermon' here actually characterizes the message of *Jonah*, or the purpose of that message, as the word of Yahweh to the people of Israel. All these categories are deemed insufficient, then, chiefly because they are too general to identify the particular literary form of *Jonah*.

---

[1] See our remarks on symmetry in Chapter II supra and also the section on "Literary Characteristics" infra.

[2] Baudissin, Die Buecher des AT, p. 595.

[3] See O. Loretz, "Herkunft und Sinn der Jona-Erzählung," BZ 5 (Jan. 1961), 19.

[4] For a discussion of theological and hermeneutical issues involved in averring the non-historical character of Jonah, see B. S. Childs, "Jonah: A Study in OT Hermeneutics," SJT 11 (1958), 53-61. Childs maintains that the authenticity of the book as a vehicle for the Word of God is not destroyed by a non-historical interpretation of its contents.

b. Partial designations

(1) Myth

Certain *Gattungen* may designate correctly sections of *Jonah*, but they do not encompass the entire book. Among them is the category of Myth. This very term is itself confusing because of its different uses and interpretations. Brevard Childs cites a "historic-philosophical" use of myth to account for the direct intervention of the Divine in unexplainable events. He delineates also a form critical use of the word to define a literary type which is concerned with stories of gods.[1] As literature the myth originated in nature religions with their emphasis upon cycles of events. The repetitive processes of nature are personified as deities and described in ritual stories.[2] In a strict sense myth presupposes a natural religion of polytheism. Nothing could be further from the historical and monotheistic thrust of Israel's faith. By definition there are no genuine myths in the OT. There may be remnants of myths, or mythological motifs, but the very myths themselves have been transformed (i.e., historicized) by the theological context in which they appear.[3] Gunkel, who introduced this Gattung into biblical studies,[4] was well aware of its limitations.[5]

---

[1] See Hitzig, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten* , p. 158ff; Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 190; Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 587; Feuillet, "Le Livre," p. 15; Wolff, "Jonabuch," RGG$_3$, col. 855; L. Dennefeld, *Introduction a L'Ancien Testament*, p. 185.

[2] See, e.g., Muller, "Jona, eine moralische Erzählung";Riessler, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 154.

[3] See Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, p. 587.

[4] See A. Lods, *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*, pp. 15, 334; M. Burrows, *What Mean These Stones?* p. 4.

[5] See Brockington, "Jonah," *Peake's Commentary*, p. 627. J. Myers ("The Book of Jonah," *The Layman's Bible Commentary* 14, p. 162) lists sermon as a possible *Gattung*, although not as his first choice.

Interest in the mythology of the OT was one product of the Religionsgeschichte school of research, which flourished during the latter half of the nineteenth century.[1] This school stressed the comparative study of religious phenomena as a key to understanding any single religion. It placed the Bible in a universal setting in order to determine its possible relationships to all other religious literature. The adherents of this school varied significantly in their method of approach and in their resulting conclusions. The extreme is perhaps typified by Hugo Winckler, who set forth a "pan-Babylonian" theory in which he maintained that the ideas of the OT were derived from and dependent upon Babylonian religion.[2] A more judicious approach was pursued by Gunkel, who "guarded against the danger of reading into the biblical literature more than was justified, by working from the OT outward to the influences which had acted upon it, instead of starting with the external data and tracing them into the OT."[3]

---

[1] Brevard S. Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, pp. 13-16. Childs concludes that neither use of the term is adequate from a phenomenological standpoint. The adequacy of the definitions, however, is not our concern here. We wish only to see how the form-critical meaning has been applied to Jonah.

[2] Weiser, The OT, p. 57f.

[3] For discussions of how Israel transformed myth by historicizing it, see Weiser, op. cit., p. 58f and Bentzen, op. cit., p. 241ff.

[4] Gunkel, Genesis, p. XIV. It ought to be noted that the definition of this Gattung as stories of the gods is a characterization of content rather than of form; cf. the relevant comments supra.

[5] Cf. his comments on the mythological themes in the biblical stories of creation in Schöpfung und Chaos (1895); cf. also The Legends of Genesis, pp. 14-18.

The Religionsgeschichtlicheschule provided the impetus, the tools, and the required data for analyzing Jonah in the light of ancient mythology. Accordingly, this particular approach to the book was popular among scholars of an earlier generation. It seems not to figure significantly in recent studies of the Gattung. We propose to survey and evaluate evidence adduced for classifying Jonah as a myth, remembering that this Gattung itself is subject to modification in a biblical framework.

From all over the ancient world come myths about fish which have been cited as parallels to the episode in Jonah 2:1,11. A classic study of these myths, and other similar stories, was published by H. Schmidt in

---

[1] See Hahn, "The Religio-Historical School and the Old Testament," op. cit., pp. 83-118.

[2] See H. Winckler, "Himmels-und Weltbild der Babylonier als Grundlage der Weltanschauung und Mythologie aller Völker," Der alte Orient III (1901), Nos. 2-3. Cf. F. Delitzsch, Babel und Bibel (1902).

[3] Hahn, op. cit., p. 91.

1907;[1] he dedicated the work to his teacher Hermann Gunkel. Schmidt collected all the data known by him to bear upon the topic and organized it under three general headings: (1) the fish as enemy; (2) the fish as savior; (3) the fish as the symbol of the underworld. Although sections of his work have been dismissed for their speculative quality,[2] other evidence which Schmidt accumulated has been recognized to contain varying degrees of validity.[3]

Among myths which depict the fish as an enemy of the gods are two from ancient Greece which have sometimes been connected with Jonah.[4] In an early form[5] the story of Hercules and Hesione tells how Hesione, daughter of the Trojan King Laomedon, is chosen by lot as an offering of appeasement for the sea-monster Poseidon. Bound to a rock in the sea she waits to be devoured. She is delivered from this fate by Hercules, who, with the help of Athene, kills the sea-monster. This myth was expanded by Lycophron[6] (c 280 B.C.?) to say that Hercules is swallowed by the fish or that he jumps down its throat before slaying it. Later the story was expanded still further to say that Hercules spent three days and three nights in the belly of the sea-monster.[1] It is only in these expanded forms that this myth bears resemblance to the episode in Jonah. The expanded versions, however, post-date the book of Jonah and may themselves be based upon or borrowed from Jonah.[2] The original Greek myth of Hercules is scarcely a parallel to the story of the fish in Jonah.

---

[1] H. Schmidt, Jona: Eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte. FRLANT.

[2] "Hans Schmidt's Jona (1907) contains much of interest, but goes too far afield and is highly speculative" (T. H. Gaster, Festivals of the Jewish Year, p. 305).

[3] We shall consider here only those portions of Schmidt's work which have also figured importantly in other mythical studies of Jonah.

[4] See Rosenmüller, Scholia in VT, p. 341ff; P. Friedrichsen, Jonas, pp. 129-135; Hitzig, op. cit., 158f.

[5] Diodorus Siculus iv.42; Apollodori, Bibliotheque, ii 5, 9-12; Ovid, Metamorphosis xi.211.

[6] Lycophron, Alexandra 33ff.

Perhaps a variation of this myth is the story of Perseus and Andromeda.[3] Cassiopeia, queen of Aethiopia, arouses the anger of sea-nymphs by vaunting her beauty above theirs. They retaliate by sending a sea-monster to ravage the coast. In order to get rid of this monster, King Cepheus is commanded to offer his daughter Andromeda to the fish. Just before she is to be devoured, however, Perseus, son of Jupiter, kills the monster. What makes this myth particularly attractive for Jonah studies is that some ancient writers[4] place the scene of the story at Joppa (cf. Jon. 1:2). Apart from this location, however, there seems to be no connection between the myth and the fish episode in Jonah.

A third Greek tale about a devouring fish is connected with the mythological Jason.[5] This story is attested on an Etrurian mural which shows Jason being swallowed by a sea-monster and on an Attic vase which portrays Jason being vomited out of the dragon. This action is parallel to that in *Jonah*, but the resemblance ceases at this point. As in the forementioned myths, the fish for Jason is an enemy of man. In *Jonah* the fish rescues a man.

---

[1] See F. Bleek, An Introduction to the OT II, p. 187.

[2] Bleek, op. cit., p. 187f. Cf. Komlós, "Jonah Legends," Etudes Orientales, p. 44; Kalisch, Book of Jonah, pp. 176-180.

[3] A summary of the myth is given in T. Bulfinch, The Age of Fable, pp. 138-141. Cf. Josephus, The Jewish War III, 418-425; Schmidt, Jona, pp. 12-22.

[4] See Josephus, idem., Pliny, Natural History v. 34. Strabo, Geography, 16.2.28. Jerome was familiar with this tradition also; see his commentary on Jonah 1:3: Sur Jonas, p. 61ff.

[5] See Schmidt, Jona, pp. 22-24.

From the Semitic world comes the Babylonian myth of Oannes. F. C. Baur[1] (1837) attempted to compare it with *Jonah*. Our knowledge of Oannes is derived from the writer Berossus (third century B.C.) though the myth itself is older.[2] Berossus described Oannes as an animal with the body of a fish, two feet, and a human voice. Each morning this monster emerged from the sea to instruct the Babylonians in culture and faith, and at sunset he returned again to the sea to acquire new wisdom.[3] Oannes may have been regarded as a god of knowledge. He has been identified with Anu,[4] with Ea,[5] and with Marduk.[6] Baur claimed that Jonah's descent into the fish and subsequent expulsion were based upon the descent and emerging of Oannes. Like Oannes, Jonah came forth to instruct a people in the knowledge of truth. Baur saw a further parallel in the fact that Oannes was a fish god and that Nineveh, the city to which Jonah went, was known as the "city of the fish."[1] To this Babylonian parallel Baur added the Assyrian myth of Adonis. Taking his clue from the fact that Adonis was slain early in life, and hence his worship was a festival of sorrow, Baur maintained that this myth lay behind the episode of the plant in *Jonah*, which died overnight and for which the prophet grieved. The *Jonah* tale is based then on the myths of Oannes and Adonis.

---

[1] F. C. Baur, "Der Prophet Jonas, ein assyrisch-babylonisch Symbol," Illgen's *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, VII, pp. 88-114. Cf. also Schmidt, *Jona*, pp. 74ff.

[2] Berosi, *Chaldaeorum Historiae*, p. 48f; 71f; cf. P. Schnabel, *Berossos*, pp. 253-256.

[3] For an Indian parallel to this myth in a story about the god Matsya Avatar, see Simpson, *The Jonah Legend*, pp. 130-133.

[4] See F. Lenormant, *Fragments Cosmogoniques*, pp. 60, 243, *etc*.

[5] A. H. Sayce, *Origin and Growth of Religion*, p. 133.

[6] L. Frobenius, *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes*, pp. 60, 102f. But see now W. G. Lambert, "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors," JCS XVI, No. 3 (1962), 73f. Lambert shows that Oannes was one of the names of Adapa. The Akkadian ^{m}ūma-an-na is to be identified with the Greek name Oannes. In the fragments of a catalogue from the library of Ashurbanipal (cf. Lambert, *op. cit.*, p. 59), this name precedes the epithet adapa (^{m}ūma-an-na a-da-p/a/). Adapa was not a god but a "legendary human"; see *infra*.

In spite of Baur's presentation, genuine parallels between the Oannes myth and *Jonah* are difficult to establish. While Oannes is a sea creature, Jonah is only a man who is swallowed by a great fish; and this fish is not a monster. Moreover, that devouring was a one-for-all happening in the story. Jonah does not move in the arena of the repetitive. His destiny is fixed by Yahweh, who himself made the sea and all therein. Finally, to claim a direct relationship between Adonis and the *qiqayon* seems far-fetched.[2]

The Adapa Myth, with its theme of man's squandered opportunity for immortality, is usually cited by scholars as a parallel to Genesis 3.[3]

---

[1] A somewhat different interpretation is offered by H. Clay Trumbull, who leans towards an historical interpretation of the book ("Jonah in Nineveh," JBL XI (1892), 53-60). He claimed that the Babylonian Oannes was the Assyrian god Dagon. Since Jonah was swallowed and ejected by a fish, the Assyrians would see him as the incarnation of Dagon, and hence they would be receptive to his message. This interpretation is untenable not only because it has to assume details of the story not supplied but especially because it violates the intent of the book, where throughout Jonah is the prophet of Yahweh, God of the sea and the dry land. Jonah is no deity, and the God for whom he speaks stands above and beyond nature. Dagon plays no part in our story. For criticisms of Trumbull, see Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 5 and König, DB, II, p. 752.

[2] Perhaps a most telling inadequacy of Baur's theory is the fact that many subsequent studies of *Jonah* do not even take it into account. Cf., e.g., Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

[3] For the text of this myth, see *ANET*, ed. by James B. Pritchard, pp. 101-103. For a discussion of the myth, see Pritchard, *Archaeology and the OT*, pp. 193-201.

Certain lines in the story, however, are worthy of mention in connection with Jonah. Intending to catch fish for the god Ea, Adapa is thrown into the sea when the southwind capsizes his boat. This wind thereby causes him to "go down to the home of the fish," and for this disaster he seeks revenge by silencing the wind. While the parallels are by no means exact, the references to a strong wind and to a fish are reminiscent of Jonah. Moreover, the fact that Adapa himself is a man and not a god brings him closer to Jonah.

The Greek and Semitic myths reviewed thus far share one feature which is opposed to the fish episode in Jonah: they depict the fish as a monster or an enemy. This difference is all the more evident when the fish in Jonah is compared with the myth of the chaos-dragon. Known in various forms throughout the ancient world, this story concerns the creation of the world by the gods out of a dreadful struggle with a pre-existent chaos. This chaos is described in ancient myths as a sea-monster and is variously named Tiamat, Leviathan, Behemoth, or Rahab.[1] Against this dragon the gods struggle to bring about order. For example, in the Enuma Elish, the god Marduk engages in deadly combat with Tiamat, the water deity or primeval mother who personifies chaos.[2] He succeeds in subduing her and then splits her skull; from the halves of her body he forms heaven and earth. Yet the victory is not once and for all.[3] Chaos is a perennial threat, both to the gods and to men, as the cycle of the seasons bears witness. Each year the battle must be fought anew against the threat of the chaos dragon.

---

[1] For a summary of the various forms of the myth, cf. Childs, Myth and Reality, pp. 17-29.

[2] Pritchard, ANET, pp. 60-72; cf. also Isaac Mendelsohn, ed., Religions of the Ancient Near East, pp. 17-46.

[3] Cf. S. Mowinckel, He That Cometh, especially p. 39ff.

Remnants of this myth may survive in parts of the OT,[1] particularly in Isaiah 51:9ff and in such Psalms as 74, 89, 68, 104. In these passages Yahweh is proclaimed as the eternal Victor over chaos; the threat of the dragon is no more. A few scholars have endeavored to interpret the great fish in Jonah as the personification of chaos, and they have isolated analogous elements to Jonah in the fight between Tiamat and Marduk.[2] Although not classifying the entire Jonah story as myth, T. K. Cheyne was among those who viewed the fish episode from this perspective. Taking a clue from the work of Tylor,[3] Cheyne declared that the fish in Jonah is to be understood mythologically as the dragon of the subterranean ocean.[4]

This point of view seems more confusing than illuminating. Strikingly absent from the Jonah story is any suggestion that the great fish is a chaos-monster. He is appointed by Yahweh to do the bidding of Yahweh. Nowhere is there even an intimation of a struggle between Yahweh and the fish. Furthermore, this fish is not the embodiment of evil; rather he is an instrument of salvation.[5] It seems certain that in no way does the myth of the chaos-dragon monster lie behind the fish episode in Jonah. To find

---

[1] See George Widengren, "Early Hebrew Myths and their Interpretation," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, pp. 149-203.

[2] P. C. A. Jensen, Das Gilgamesch-epos in der Weltliteratur, pp. 801-810; Schmidt, Jona, pp. 78-87.

[3] E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, I, p. 339.

[4] T. K. Cheyne, EB, col. 2568.

[5] Cf. Kuhl's criticism of the attempt to read the myth of the chaos-dragon into Jonah in The Prophets of Israel, p. 176.

To find this myth there is to manufacture it.[1]

Equally erroneous is the effort to interpret Jonah in terms of ancient sun-myths. Goldziher was perhaps one of the first to make this suggestion.[2] He noted that ancient men, observing the sun sinking into the sea at night and rising the next morning at the opposite point, concluded that the sun was swallowed by a monster who later spat it out.[3] It is this myth of the battle of the Sun against the monster of the sea which is preserved in Jonah.[4] Goldziher does not doubt the historical character of the prophet Jonah but holds that mythological motifs collected about this person, the most prominent of these being his abode in the belly of the whale /sic/. "This trait," he says, "is eminently solar."[5] Building upon this view, Frobenius finds Jonah to be a myth of sunrise and sunset.[6] He connects this story with both the myths of Tiamat and of Oannes. (The Oannes story he regards as a somewhat confused revision of the Tiamat myth.) Just as the sun rises from the primeval waters (i.e., Tiamat), so Jonah emerges from the water. The ancient fight to determine whether Marduk (Oannes) or Tiamat is supreme is reenacted and answered in the Jonah tale. In addition, the Egyptian sun-myths concerning Osiris and Re can be adduced as prototypes for Jonah.[7]

---

[1] George Adam Smith, who follows closely the view of Cheyne, tried to answer the objection that the fish is not destructive but rather redemptive by averring that the author of Jonah adapted and transformed the ancient chaos myth (The Book of the Twelve Prophets, p. 513). It is not, however, that one can recognize the transformation of the chaos-myth in Jonah; it is, rather, that one cannot recognize the presence of that myth at all.

[2] Ignaz Goldziher, Mythology among the Hebrews.

[3] Ibid., p. 101. [4] Ibid., p. 28. [5] Ibid., p. 103.

[6] Leo Frobenius, op. cit., p. 60.

[7] Ibid., p. 168ff.

A variation on this theme connects Jonah in the fish with the disappearance of the moon for three days before a new moon.[1]

Once again these explanations fail to account for the fact that there is no trace of a struggle in Jonah between the fish (or the sea) and Jonah himself, or between the forces of nature and Yahweh. Jonah does not resemble a sun-god (or moon-god) in conflict with chaos. The fish is but the instrument of Yahweh for delivering a disobedient man. To find a solar myth in this episode is to read it in.[2]

More akin to the fish episode in Jonah than the myths considered thus far are stories in which an animal is portrayed as savior. Perhaps it is significant that most of these accounts do not concern gods, and hence they are not to be classified as myths.[3] One example of the myth, however, is the Hindu tale of the infant god Pradyumna who was thrown into the ocean by the demon Sambara and then saved by a fish who swallowed him.[4]

From our survey it is evident that myths about sea-creatures swallowing gods are common throughout the ancient world. At this point our concern is to decide to what extent, if any, the story of Jonah shares this mythology. As we have seen, most myths adduced are not genuine parallels to Jonah. The fish in Jonah is not an enemy; it is not the chaos-dragon. The prophet Jonah in his once-for-all abode in the fish does not manifest the characteristics of a sun-god. Thus, to say that the author of Jonah is deliberately borrowing from any myth or group of myths is to exceed the evidence.[1] He is not borrowing myth but rather he is utilizing a theme common in both the mythical and non-mythical[2] literature of the ancient world. He moulds this theme to fit the Tendenz of his narrative.[3] From a literary standpoint he needs a way of rescuing Jonah from the sea. Available to him is the motif of a fish swallowing a man and later ejecting him. He uses this device in the composition of his story, for it serves a useful purpose.[4] From a didactic and theological standpoint the episode points up the complete power and control of Yahweh over nature and over his disobedient prophet. There is no evidence that the author uses the story because it is a myth; nor is the story a myth as he uses it.[5] Moreover, even if we acknowledge the possibility of a mythological milieu behind the fish episode, it is no basis for classifying the book of Jonah as a myth. That episode occupies only two verses of the entire story.

---

[1] Cf. A. Jeremias, Handbuch des altorientalischen Geisteskultur, p. 167; The OT in the Light of the Ancient Near East II, p. 306f, note 1.

[2] Gunkel seems at this point to be reading into the story when he claims that the saga of Jonah in the fish was originally a myth of the sun-god (Die orientalischen Literatur, Die Kultur der Gegenwart, I, 7, p. 69).

[3] We shall consider these non-mythical stories in the section on folk-tales infra.

[4] Simpson, op. cit., pp. 124-127, gives other possible Indian

---

parallels. His aim is to interpret Jonah as a story connected with initiatory rites. Although he calls the story legend, he means by that term what we have described as myth.

[1] In his second edition, Nowack says that resemblances between Jonah and these myths are purely external and that a mythological interpretation is contrary to the spirit of Jonah (Die Kleinen Propheten, p. 191). In his third edition, however, he admits the possibility of mythological influences (op. cit., p. 185).

[2] See infra.

[3] Cf. Komlós, op. cit., pp. 47-47: "...even if our author knew such legends he has altered them so as to suit his own idealistic aims and has made them his very own." (Komlós uses the word legend as synonymous with myth - another example of the confusion in form critical nomenclature.)

[4] Brockington, op. cit., p. 628.

[5] Cf. Kuenen, who says that even if hints of ancient myths can be detected in Jonah, they have been transformed so completely by the writer that they no longer exist independently as myths (Einleitung II, p. 425f).

A. Jeremias cites several other mythological elements in the remainder of the book.[1] He believes that the flight of Jonah and the tempest at sea are paralleled in the Greek myth of Dragoras.[2] Like Baur, he finds a mythological motif in the flourishing and withering plant. Yet even if we admit the possibility of these elements, we still cannot describe Jonah as a myth. To detect similarities between some parts of the tale and ancient myths does not establish myth as the Gattung of the book. As already indicated, the classification of Jonah as myth was probably the result of the over-emphasis which some adherents of the Religionsgeschichtlicheschule placed on extra-biblical parallels.[3] At most, myth is only a partial designation for the background of a very few items in Jonah.

(2) Fable

If there are hints of myth in sections of Jonah, there are also signs of the fable. In using the term fable (un apologue) J. Coppens means by it an imaginative story which conveys transcendent or universal truths.[4] This meaning is too general to specify a Gattung. If the term were employed in its technical sense as a story about animals or plants,[5] it would aptly fit parts of *Jonah*.[1] In addition to the great fish (2:1,11), there are the animals of Nineveh who, like men, participate in the rituals of mourning and repentance (3:7-8) and for whom Yahweh manifests special concern (4:11). There is the *gigayon* which is provided for shade and for which Jonah manifests special concern (4:6,9,10). There is also the worm which causes the plant to wither (4:7). These elements partake of the character of a fable, but they do not dominate the story. In Chapter 1 they appear not at all. Elsewhere they serve the story in literary and didactic ways, but they themselves are not the essence of the story. We conclude, then, that there are motifs of the fable in *Jonah* but that the story itself is not a fable.[2]

---

[1] A. Jeremias, The OT in the Light of the Ancient Near East II, pp. 305-307.

[2] Having committed treachery, Dragoras fled from Melos via ship. When a storm came up, the sailors believed Dragoras to be the cause of the trouble. See Cicero, De naturum deorum 3,37.

[3] On the dangers of over-stressing parallels, cf. the relevant comments by S. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," JBL (March, 1962), 1-13.

[4] J. Coppens, Les Douze Petits Prophètes, p. 29. G. F. Moore (Literature of the OT, p. 140) apparently uses the term "fable" as synonymous with "short story."

[5] For descriptions of the Gattung of fable, see Weiser, The OT, p. 63f; Bentzen, op. cit., I, p. 179. For an example of the fable in the literature of the ancient Near East, see the Akkadian tale, "Dispute

(3) Folk-tale

Akin to both myth and fable is the folk-tale (*Märchen*), which is the most inclusive of these three categories. While myth is restricted to stories about the gods and fable to stories about animals and plants, the folk-tale is equally at home in the world of the human, the natural, and the super-natural. In it the realm of fantasy and the realm of reality mingle freely.[3] Goblins and spirits, giants and dragons, men and

---

between the Date Palm and the Tamarish," ANET, p. 410f.

[1] Bleeker, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[2] On a larger scale, Weiser observes that nowhere in the OT does the fable have "independent significance"; wherever the form appears, it has been appropriated and thus transformed in terms of the distinctiveness of OT faith (*The OT*, p. 64). Cf., e.g., Jotham's fable in Judges 9:7-15, where the didactic and theological element is strong, as the whole tale concerns the meaning of kingship in ancient Israel.

[3] Cf. Weiser, *The OT*, pp. 62-63: The folk-tale is "by its nature, like the myth, a floating thing, tied neither to space nor to time, nor to the laws of what happens in our experience; it knows no dividing line between men and animals and no gulf between the fashionings of the imagination and sober reality."

animals, trees and plants, rivers and springs, mountains and seas - all of these together and/or separately constitute the subject matter of folk-tales.[1] An individual story may reflect one realm more forcefully than another. Perhaps for this reason Bentzen seeks to distinguish between the chimerical folk-tale, which emphasizes the imagination, and the short story folk-tale, which tends toward realism.[2] The former he sees as characteristic among Indo-Europeans and the latter among Semites. Yet, as Bentzen himself asserts, this distinction cannot be rigidly held.[3]

The _Gattung_ of _Märchen_ is very ancient; it belongs to the primitive beginnings of the art of story-telling;[4] and it is to be found among all peoples the world over.[5] "If ever there was an art on which the whole community of mankind has worked...it is this of the ageless tale."[6] Before the time of Gunkel the folk-tale was never seriously considered in connection with the OT. No doubt one reason for this neglect is provided in the very fabric of OT religion. There is little, if any, room in a literature proclaiming historical revelation for a world of fantasy, imagination, and magic. The very essence of Israel's faith militates against the use of the _Gattung_ of folk-tale. Nevertheless, the results of the _Religionsgeschichte_ school make it clear that one cannot rule out altogether the possibility of folk-tale motifs in the OT. This method of research had disclosed a number of folkloristic parallels to sections of the OT. Consequently, biblical scholarship is compelled to reckon with this *Gattung* but, as in the cases of myth and fable, in a modified form. No pure *Märchen* is to be found in the OT; everywhere fairy-tale"has been turned into history, *i.e.*, has been attached to definite historical places or persons."[1] And it is employed not to entertain but to instruct.

---

[1] H. Gunkel, _Das Märchen im Alten Testament_, p. 9f.

[2] Bentzen, _op. cit._, I, pp. 234, 240f.

[3] Among the many examples which he cites of chimerical motifs in the OT are the helpful animal and the miraculous tree in _Jonah_ (_ibid._, p. 241).

[4] Gunkel, _Märchen_, p. 9.

[5] For a discussion of the folk-tale, including types, history, geographical distribution, and meaning, see Joseph Campbell, "Folkloristic Commentary," _Grimm's Fairy Tales_, pp. 833-863.

[6] _Ibid._, p. 863.

Perhaps *Jonah* is the one book in the OT where folkloristic elements are strongest.[2] Gunkel and others[3] have pointed out a number of them. In Chapters 1 and 2 the following themes bear the marks of folklore: (1) the flight of a disobedient man; (2) the threat of a mighty storm at sea; (3) the casting of lots to determine guilt; (4) the expulsion of the guilty from the ship; (5) the resulting cessation of the storm; and (6) the opportune presence of an animal to save the man overboard. In the examples *infra* one may find parallels to all of these six themes.

From Buddhist literature[4] comes the story of one Mittavindaka who, disobeying the will of his mother, puts out to sea from Benares.[5] After six days the ship on which he is traveling ceases to move. Lots are cast to determine who is responsible for this trouble, and three times the lots point to Mittavindaka. He is removed from the ship and put on a raft.[1] Thereupon the ship continues without difficulty. Egyptian literature (c 2500 B.C.) tells of an unnamed official who, on his way to the royal mines of Pyneers, encounters a storm at sea and is shipwrecked.[2] Afloat on a raft for three days, he is rescued by a snake, who takes him to its dwelling place and assures him that a ship is due to come for him. The Greek story of Arion provides another example of a rescue from drowning via a helpful animal.[3] This lyricist is forced to jump into the sea by treacherous sailors who wish to possess his many treasures. His singing allures Dolphins to him and one of them takes Arion upon its back to carry him safely to shore. Instances of animals swallowing human beings are also a part of folklore, but, as in the case of myths, these animals are often the enemies of men. Such tales as "Little Red Riding Hood," whose grandmother was swallowed by a wicked wolf, represents an inverse theme of the fish story in *Jonah*. The Italian tale *Pinocchio* (1883)[4] contains several episodes reminiscent of sections of *Jonah*, including a storm at sea which endangers the boat on which Geppetto, the father of Pinocchio, is traveling. The boat sinks and Geppetto is swallowed by a terrible shark. This same fate befalls Pinocchio, as he seeks to rescue his father. While the shark is not a friendly animal, in swallowing these two he does save them from drowning. Later they both emerge unharmed from the great fish. There is a New Guinea tale of islanders being swallowed by a whale and subsequently re-appearing intact on dry land.[1] There is a similar tale in Polynesian literature.[2] Thus in world folklore many stories feature animals who save men from drowning. These stories are widespread in time and in place. It is fair to conclude that *Jonah* is in part a Hebrew adaptation of this universal theme.

---

[1] Weiser, *The OT*, p. 62. Cf. Bentzen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 241: "But nowhere in the OT we find *pure fairy-tales*, only a strong conjunction with legendary elements and perhaps with historical reminiscences."

[2] Gunkel, *Märchen*, p. 13f; *ibid.*, "Jonabuch," RGG$_2$, col. 367.

[3] Schmidt treats the story primarily as *Märchen* (*Jona*, *passim*). Cf. also K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, p. 246; Baudissin, *Einleitung*, p. 594f.

[4] E. B. Cowell, ed., *The Jātaka*, IV, No. 439, esp. p. 2.

[5] See E. Hardy, "Jona c. 1 und Jāt. 439," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 50 (1896), 153; cf. Schmidt, *Jona*, p. 142f.

---

[1] As the sailors remove Mittavindaka, they say, "Let not many perish for the sole sake of this one "(Jātaka, *op. cit.*, p. 2); cf. the remark of the sailors who remove Jonah from their ship, "...let us not perish for this man's life..." (1:14).

[2] Fritz Hommel, *Die Insel der Seligen*, p. 18f; A. Wiedemann, *Die Unterhaltungslitteratur der alten Agypter*, p. 18f; S. Moscati, *The Face of the Ancient Orient*, pp. 141-143.

[3] Schmidt, *Jona*, pp. 96-105; Gunkel, *Märchen*, p. 133; Bulfinch, *op. cit.*, pp. 223-227.

[4] C. Collodi, *Pinocchio: The Tale of a Puppet*.

In addition to the above six folkloristic elements in Chapters 1 and 2 of *Jonah*, Chapters 3 and 4 contain nine others: (1) the appearance of royalty and nobility contrasted with common people; (2) a royal proclamation which unrealistically effects total repentance; (3) the mingling of men and beasts indiscriminately;[3] (4) the attributing of human characteristics to animals; (5) the fantastic growth of a wonder plant; (7) the elements of wind and (8) of sun appearing at the right moment to cause distress; (9) possibly a concern for children.[4]

---

[1] Sir James George Frazer, *Folk-lore in the OT*, III, p. 82f.

[2] L. Radermacher, "Walfischmythen," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 9 (1906), 248-252.

[3] When this motif is understood, it seems unnecessary to eliminate, re-arrange, or explain logically the verbal references in Jon. 3:7-8 (cf. the relevant comments on these vs in Chapters I and II). In a folk-tale it is perfectly natural to have both men and beasts tasting, feeding, drinking water, covering themselves with sackcloth, and crying mightily.

[4] The reference in 4:11 to "more than a hundred and twenty thousand persons who do not know their right hand from their left" has been interpreted in two ways: 1) all the inhabitants of Nineveh who do not know right from wrong (see D. J. Wiseman, *Illustrations from Biblical Archaeo-*

Many parallels to these nine motifs can be cited in international folk-lore. One has only to recall favorite stories from his childhood or to consult collections of folk-tales[1] to find numerous illustrations. For example, kings and nobles figure in tales like "Cinderella", and "Brother Frolick's Adventures". Here too royalty mingles with peasantry, and frequently royal decrees are issued for all peoples in a kingdom. In "Little Black Sambo", "The Faithful Beasts", and "The Little Tales about Toads", the worlds of men and of animals flow easily into each other, and elements of nature cooperate miraculously also. Wonder plants are central in "The Royal Turnip", "The Wonderful Plant", "The Enchanted Trees", and "Jack and the Beanstalk". In this last tale the enormous beanstalk grows up over night (cf. Jon. 4:10). Children are of special interest in "Snow-White and Red Rose", "The Little Shepherd Boy", and "The Little Lamb and the Little Fish".[2]

Now, to be sure, there are numerous folkloristic themes which appear not at all in Jonah. There are no giants, no fairies, no wicked step-mothers,

---

logy, p. 51; Brockington, "Jonah," p. 629; cf. A. Parrot, Nineveh and the OT, p. 86); 2) only the children of the city who literally do not know their right hand from their left or who morally do not know right from wrong (see Bewer, op. cit., p. 63f; Weiser, ATD, p. 225; Rinaldi, "Giona," p. 213, etc.). The first interpretation would seem to be weakened by the fact that elsewhere in Jonah the citizens of Nineveh are depicted as morally sensitive and concerned; they do know right from wrong (cf. 3:5,8, 10). The second interpretation seems the more plausible: the reference in 4:11 is to the children of Nineveh who, literally and/or morally, do not know right from left (cf. I Kgs. 3:7-9; Is. 7:15f).

[1] See, inter alia, the following collections: Grimm's Fairy Tales; Andersen's Fairy Tales; Burmese Folk-Tales; the Hindu Panchatantra.

[2] The Tales cited here have been selected at random; many others could be adduced as illustrations of folkloristic elements which also characterize sections of Jonah.

no magic spells, and no marriages to make life happy everafter. Some of these items have no place at all in the content of *Jonah*. Some are excluded by the theological presuppositions of the author. Yet the many folkloristic features which are clearly present throughout the book and have been delineated above altogether exhibit four, or possibly five, major *Märchenmotives*: (1) miscellaneous tales about men in general (*Allerlei Märchen von Männern*);[1] (2) stories about men of rank (*Standesmärchen*);[2] (3) stories of nature (*Naturwesen*);[3] (4) stories of plants (*Pflanzenmärchen*).[4] (5) Finally, perhaps in this context it is not total invention to see in the veiled allusion to children in Jonah 4:11 a hint of another *Märchenmotive*: *Kindern-* or *Jünglingmärchen*.[5]

All the analogies adduced *supra* do not mean either that *Jonah* resembles particular folk-tales in detail or that *Jonah* is dependent upon or borrowed from other stories. One cannot establish here extra-biblical literary sources for the *Büchlein*. What we have done is to point out numerous motifs in *Jonah* which parallel *Märchen* literature the world over. Unquestionably *Jonah* reflects both subjects and themes common in international folklore. The recognition of this fact is a very important key to determining the *Gattung* of the book.

Certainly the abundance of folk-tale material in *Jonah* brings us closer to establishing the *Gattung* than has been possible heretofore. Yet even these many elements do not encompass the whole story. Strictly speaking, the *Gattung* of *Märchen* fails to embrace three areas of crucial importance. First is the historicity of the central human character, the prophet Jonah (II Kings 14:25). He does not bear the marks of a typical folk-tale hero or villain. Second is the transcendent and omnipotent Yahweh, who personally controls the action of the tale. All is brought under his will and direction. In Him magic is transformed into miracle.[1] While the *Märchen* does allow for the supernatural in forms of fairies, witches, spells, and enchantments, and occasionally it may even speak of "God", it has no room for the Creator and Lord of heaven and earth to whom the Bible bears witness. Third is the didactic intent of *Jonah*, which is present from beginning to end. The *Märchen* proper seeks to entertain; it does not endeavor to teach. Therefore, if we are to designate *Jonah* as *Märchen*, we are forced either to disregard these three significant areas or else to modify the *Gattung* of *Märchen* so that it can include them. As already pointed out, this latter alternative must be pursued if *Märchen* is to be applied to the OT at all. Still one does not have to accept this alternative here. He can acknowledge both the multitude of *Märchenmotives* in *Jonah* as well as the inadequacy of that category for the entire story. And he can look elsewhere for an all-embracing designation of the *Gattung*.

---

[1] Gunkel, *Märchen*, p. 133f. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 152.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 33f. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[5] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 34f.

d. Other possibilities

Thus far we have evaluated as inadequate all but four of the many suggested forms for *Jonah*. These four - allegory, parable, midrash, and legend - are mentioned most frequently by scholars and deserve close scrutiny. That they are not necessarily mutually exclusive types is evident by the fact that some scholars have combined two or more of them in describing *Jonah*. For the sake of clarity we shall discuss them separately.

---

[1] "The magic of things becomes God's miracle" (Weiser, *The OT*, p. 63). For some general observations about the incompatibility of magic with the faith of Israel, see G. E. Wright, *The OT against its Environment*, p. 78ff.

(1) Allegory

By definition allegory is surely the antonym of history.[1] It is a literary form in which every detail in a story has symbolic meaning.[2] No doubt the unusual variety of details in *Jonah* has prompted not a few scholars to call it an allegory. This idea is an old one, and it has received numerous and varied treatments.[3] Pursuing lines developed first by J. S. Bloch,[4] the English scholar, C. H. H. Wright viewed *Jonah* as an allegory of the history of Israel and finally of the Messiah.[5] Jonah represents the people Israel who had been disobedient to their God-given mission. The name Jonah, or dove, is applied to Ephraim in Hosea 7:11.

---

[1] As contradictory as these two forms are, however, Kleinert has attempted to combine them. While vigorously affirming the historicity of *Jonah*, he maintains that it is also to be interpreted allegorically. Thus, he dubs it "symbolic history" and adds that there is typological significance in it (*op. cit.*, p. 7).

[2] D. T. Evans (*Book of Jonah*, p. 43) defines allegory as "a description of one thing under the name or image of another which is to some extent like unto it." Bentzen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 180, calls it "...a *series of metaphors*, all with their meaning".

[3] As early as 1723 Hermann von der Hardt was interpreting *Jonah* as a political allegory concerned with the reign of Manasseh. Like Jonah, Manasseh was unfaithful to Yahweh; subsequently he was taken captive by the Assyrians (*i.e.*, the meaning of the fish in Jonah), and later upon his release he repented (cf. II Kgs. 21 and II Chron. 33). Chapters 3 and 4 of *Jonah* Hardt saw as a history of the reign of Josiah. *AEnigmata Prisci Orbis*.

[4] J. S. Bloch, *Studiem zur Geschichte der Sammlung der althëbraische Literatur*, 1875.

[5] C. H. H. Wright, "The Book of Jonah considered from an Allegorical Point of View," *Biblical Essays*, 1886, pp. 34-98. A summary of Wright's view is given in *ibid.*, *An Introduction to the OT*, pp. 207-213.

Moreover, the name Amittai can be read symbolically, as derived from the root אמת, 'truth'.[1] Jonah's flight from Yahweh (1:3) symbolizes Israel's repeated unfaithfulness to her mission; the mighty storm (1:4), "sent forth upon the sea of nations," is the judgment of God.[2] Historically, the storm represents the Assyrian and Babylonian powers, and the wares of the sailors (1:5) are the tribute-money which other nations offered to their gods to deliver them from Assyria and Babylon. But the offer was made to no avail. Even Yahweh would not save Jerusalem from the enemy; the sleeping Jonah (1:5) "admirably describes the state of Israel previous to the Babylonian captivity."[3] Yet when calamity does come and the lot falls on Israel (1:7), then she proclaims her true faith as "a protest against idolatry" (1:9).[4] Jonah's suggestion that he be cast into the sea (1:12) embodies the belief of prophecy that "the way to a national amelioration lay through a national death."[5] The fish symbolizes the ancient world powers who had conquered Israel (cf. Isaiah 27 and Jer. 51:17,34,44). The time span of 3 days represants the short period of the Babylonian Exile (cf. Hosea 6:1, 2).[6] The fact that Jonah is kept alive and intact in the fish denotes that

> while other nations deported from their lands were absorbed into the body of the conquering nation, Israel was not thus

---

[1] For a discussion of the meaning and use of these names in the OT and in rabbinic literature, see Knight, *Ruth and Jonah*, pp. 56-60; 90f.

[2] Wright, "The Book of Jonah," p. 47. [3] *Ibid*., p. 48.

[4] *Ibid*., p. 50. [5] *Ibid*., p. 51.

[6] For an interesting variation of the symbolic interpretation of the fish, see C. J. Ball, "Babylonian Hieroglyphs," PSBA 20 (1898), 9-11. Ball observes that the cuneiform character for Nineveh is a compound of *house* and *fish*. He suggests that Jonah's three days in Nineveh (cf. 3:3) might be symbolized by his three days in the fish, just as the Babylonian exile is compared with being swallowed by a dragon in Jer. 51:34.

> absorbed, but was kept nationally distinct as a people (Num. xxiii.9) and the prophets foresaw that it alone of the nations should be restored and brought back to the land of promise, once granted to them by the Most High.[1]

Wright admits the unsuitability of the Psalm in the context of the story,[2] but he argues for its appropriateness allegorically as illustrative of the Exilic period.[3] Being disgorged from the fish (*i.e.*, the Exile), Jonah (*i.e.*, the dove Israel) was resurrected to new life. In this episode Wright sees an analogy to the Messiah, whom the Rabbis also described as a dove.[4] Jonah's preaching to Nineveh symbolizes the activity of Israel during the Restoration. As instructor to the nations, she often predicted their downfall (3:4). "Under their poor shelter in their desolated country" (cf. the booth, 4:5), "the Jews watched and waited to see what would become of the great city of the nations."[5] Jonah's displeasure at the outcome (4:1-3) is exactly the sentiment of the returned exiles who chafed at the non-fulfillment of prophecies about the destruction of the Gentiles.[6] The plant about which Jonah rejoiced is none other than Zerubbabel whom Cyrus placed at the head of the restored Israel (cf. Ezra 1:8, I Chron. 3:19)! Zerubbabel became in the faith of the Jews a Messianic figure, the Anointed of Yahweh (Haggai 2:23; cf. Lam. 4:20); under his shadow Israel would sit with delight (cf. Jonah 4:6). Yet Zerubbabel was not the Messiah; he was taken away, as the plant withered and died by the attack of a worm (Jon. 4:7; cf. Is. 14:11; Job 21:26).[7] The purpose of his death was to point the way to a Greater One, to the Messiah for all men, and this truth is allegorized in the death of the qiqayon, which points to God's mercy for the nations (Jon. 4:10-11).

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 55. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 56-62.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 61: "It is highly significant that almost every sentence of the song of Jonah is either directly borrowed from, or can be illustrated by, the songs sung either in anticipation of the captivity, or during the dark days of Israel's exile from her land."

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 64-66. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 85. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 84f. [7] *Ibid.*, p.87f.

In the essay by Wright the allegorical view of Jonah has received its most elaborate expression.[1] With modifications Cheyne proposes a similar interpretation.[2] He sees the episode of the fish as the main point of the allegory: Israel's punishment in the Exile was used by God for good. After this event, says Cheyne, Israel did take up her prophetic mission as commanded by Yahweh, but, like Jonah, she did it in an unloving spirit which displeased God. She was disappointed that the prophetic judgments uttered against the heathen nations had not materialized. In regard to the fish, Cheyne thinks that the allegorical theory of Bloch, Wright, and Kleinert needs supplementation from the realm of mythology.[3] He agrees that the fish "is the all-absorbing empire of Babylonia which swallowed up Israel - not, however, to destroy it, but to preserve it and to give it room for repentance."[4]

Surely any evaluation of Jonah as allegory must take into account the large and impressive group of scholars who adhere to this view.[5] There appears to be an attractiveness and a plausibility about it. Yet its defects are even more apparent. For instance, there may be symbolism in the use of the name Jonah,[1] but from this fact alone one cannot infer that the entire book is an allegory. One of the chief weaknesses of the theory is exhibited in the diverse statements of it. Wright develops the idea consistently throughout in all details, whereas G. A. Smith only sees the main points (i.e., Jonah, the sea, the fish, and Nineveh) as allegorical. There is discrepancy among scholars as to how much of the story and what parts of it are allegorical. An additional difficulty is that the same detail may convey different meaning to different writers. For some writers Nineveh is the symbol of the heathen world; for others it is a covering name for Jerusalem.[2] Further, the insistence that the fish is a symbol of punishment (i.e., the Exile) is contrary to the facts of the story itself. It is the storm which inflicts punishment upon Jonah. The fish is the instrument of salvation, not a punitive agent. These differences in interpretation indicate that no precise clue is provided in Jonah itself for an allegory. There are allegories in the OT, notable among them the story of Oholah and Oholibah (Ezekiel 23) and of the shepherd and two

---

[1] Kleinert, op. cit., pp. 5-7, adheres in substance to this interpretation. Jonah symbolizes Israel and the Ninevites represent the heathen world, to whom Israel was called to preach but refused. The great fish is "the secular power appointed by God for the scourge of Israel and of the earth." The Psalm is to be understood as Israel seeking God in her time of adversity. The vomiting of Jonah upon the dry land marks the end of the Exilic period. The remainder of the story is concerned with the Restoration, during which time Israel continued her vocation under God.

[2] T. K. Cheyne, EB, cols. 2566-2568.

[3] Idem. [4] Ibid., col. 2568.

[5] See Evans, op. cit., pp. 44-49. In addition to the scholars mentioned already, a number of others support the allegorical interpretation in some form. Somewhat like Kleinert, Orelli combines allegory with history

---

(op. cit., p. 168ff). König speaks of Jonah as "symbolic narrative" (DB, II, pp. 746f; 749-52). John Paterson (The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets, p. 281f) follows Cheyne and G. A. Smith (The Twelve, p. 498ff and passim). Even though he does not use the word allegory, H. H. Rowley also interprets the book thus (The Growth of the OT, p. 114). By the term allegory Lanchester means a simple story as opposed to an "actual record of events." (Obadiah and Jonah, pp. 38-45, esp. pp. 42,44). See also A. W. F. Blunt, The Prophets of Israel, p. 105.

[1] Budde would deny this relationship altogether. That Jonah means 'dove' is only a coincidence, he says (JE, p. 230).

[2] Cf. Sellin, Introduction, p. 174.

staffs (Zechariah 11:4-17). While we are told explicitly that these passages are allegorical (Ez. 23:4 and Zech. 11:7), nowhere are we given this kind of clue in Jonah. An allegorical interpretation of Jonah is primarily derived from and dependent upon many other parts of Scripture.[1] To deduce the literary form and meaning of one passage from the contents of other scattered passages is a highly dubious methodology. It certainly provides an opportunity for one to read into the passage ideas which are not really there, even though they may sound plausible. Unless definite proof of an allegory is provided within a given unit itself, the search for hidden meanings in it can go in any and all directions. As Kuhl observes, this type of research results in all kinds of ingenious interpretations which are most often not valid.[2] We conclude that there is no substantial evidence provided in Jonah to indicate that it is an allegory.[3]

(2) Parable

Like allegory, the term parable is an extremely popular literary designation for our book.[4] A few scholars seem unable to choose between these two types.[5] Even some who do decide nevertheless mix the two categories in their detailed expositions.[1] Strictly speaking, however, allegory and parable cannot be equated. Beyond the general similarity that they are both forms of didactic fiction lies a basic difference: Whereas in an allegory each detail of the story has symbolic meaning, in a parable the story as a whole serves one central point. Thus a parable is apt to be a clear, brief, and simple story in contrast to the more complex and detailed allegorical form.[2] As a didactic device, the parable intends to clarify, not to confuse. Its central point can be readily grasped by the listener.[3]

---

[1] E.g., Hosea, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah.

[2] Kuhl, The OT, p. 210.

[3] Cf. Gottwald: "The problem of course is that no allegorical clue is provided and the reconstruction grows appallingly arbitrary in the search for veiled references to Israel's historical experience" (A Light to the Nations, p. 520). Similarly, Bentzen declares that an allegory "here as nearly always is arbitrary" (op. cit., II, p. 146).

[4] Among those critics who call Jonah a parable are Cornill, Dummelow, Robert and Tricot, Feuillet, Henshaw, Bewer, G. W. Anderson, Wade, C. F. Kent, and Steinmann.

[5] A. Cohen (op. cit., p. 137), Hanson (op. cit., pp. 6f, 12), and Knight (op. cit., p. 54f) call Jonah either an allegory or a parable.

If our comments on the nature of a parable are in substance correct,[4] then it would seem questionable whether this Gattung is an appropriate or accurate one for Jonah. The book is not a simple narrative; it contains many and various elements. There is a complexity about the external features of the story which militates against its presenting simply and clearly one subject or central point. This observation is re-enforced when one considers the many suggestions which have been made as to the meaning of the parable. For instance, a number of scholars maintain that Jonah is centrally concerned with the nature and character of prophecy. Hitzig sees in it the apologetic aim of showing divine justification for unfulfilled prophecies.[1] Vatke detects three lessons:[2] (1) A prophet cannot withdraw from the divine commission, and hence he is not responsible for its consequences; (2) not all prophecy is fulfilled because of God's mercy; (3) the honor of a prophet is not damaged by his unfulfilled prophecies. A different theme is extracted by Ewald, who holds that Jonah teaches the relationship between repentance and salvation.[3] Other scholars believe that Jonah combats Jewish nationalism by emphasizing the all-inclusive love of God.[4] A. Cohen states, "The essential teaching is that the

---

[1] James Smart exemplifies this tendency. Although he claims in his introductory remarks that the parable is that "form of literature into which the book of Jonah fits most naturally" ("Jonah," IB VI, p. 872), in his exegesis he turns the story into an allegory: Jonah is Israel asleep "in false security" (p. 881); the sailors are "specimens of the heathen world" (p. 883); the fish is the symbol of the Exile and the Return (p. 874); the rest of the story (Chapters 3 and 4) is possibly reminiscent of the post-exilic period when a chastened Israel takes up her commission "grudgingly" (p. 888). Cf. also G. A. Smith, op. cit., p. 498ff, 514-541 passim.

[2] Cf. the contrast drawn by A. G. Hebert: "While...the Parable proper is consistent as a story, in the Allegory a detailed correspondence is suggested between particular points in the simile and the application, which can sometimes tear the story to pieces" (A Theological Wordbook of the Book, ed. by Alan Richardson, p. 162).

[3] Two OT parables illustrate this point: (1) The story of the ewe lamb told by Nathan to David (II Samuel 12:1-4); its central meaning is made explicit in v 7. (2) The parable of the vineyard in Isaiah 5:1-7, the last verse stating the message. Observe how brief, uncluttered, and clear these stories are; there is no doubt of their meaning. (On the Gattung of the story of the Vineyard, however, cf. Bentzen, op. cit., I, p. 179, who thinks that it may be an allegory. It is sometimes difficult to maintain a sharp distinction between parable and allegory.)

[4] The classic work on the nature and meaning of parable is a product of NT research: Jülicher, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, I and II. Jülicher described this Gattung as having "one single point and that a simple one."

Recently, however, his work has come under criticism. Writing specifically about the parables of Jesus, J. J. Vincent argues, contra Jülicher, that (1) these parables partake of Semitic exaggeration and hence are not simple; (2) the distinction between allegory and parable cannot be sharp and rigid, since in all comparisons allegory of some kind is unavoidable; (3) parables are often riddles, in accordance with Oriental story-telling techniques, and hence they may be confusing rather than clarifying (J. J. Vincent, "The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation," Studia Evangelica in Texte und Untersuchungen LXXIII, pp. 79-99). Be that as it may, we follow here the traditional interpretation of the term parable as set forth by Jülicher.

[1] Hitzig, Die Kleinen Propheten, p. 174f.

[2] Vatke, Einleitung in das AT, p. 688.

[3] H. Ewald, Die Jüngsten Propheten des Alten Bundes, III, p. 236f.

[4] See inter alia, Bleek, DeWette, Farrar, Cornill, Eiselen, H. W. Robinson.

Gentiles should not be grudged God's love, care, and forgiveness.[1]

Apart from the question of the validity of each of these and other interpretations,[2] together their diversity supports our contention that the narrative of Jonah is not a parable in the traditional sense of that term.[3] There are many facets to the form and to the content of the narrative. It is not a simple story with one central thought.

(3) Midrash

Some critics who call Jonah an allegory[4] and some who call it a parable[5] add to their respective designations the word midrash. Other scholars hold that the term midrash is sufficient in itself to describe the literary genre of the book.

Before we can consider whether or not this designation is appropriate for Jonah, we must determine what the word midrash means. As used by scholars, the term is ambiguous and lends itself to a variety of interpretations. It is sometimes employed in almost a pejorative sense to denote glosses in the biblical text.[6] Often it means an imaginative story or fanciful commentary upon Scripture.[7] It designates a method of exegesis.

---

[1] Cohen, op. cit., p. 137.

[2] The various interpretations cited here are only samples; to the survey others might be added. E.g., Balscheit finds in Jonah not one but four meanings: (1) It is impossible to escape God; (2) God rescues from death; (3) God summons the world to penitence; (4) God is merciful (Der Gottesbund: Einführung in das Alte Testament, pp. 218f).

[3] Cf. Aalders, op. cit., pp. 15-19.

[4] Paterson, op. cit., p. 281; Evans, op. cit., p. 44; Cheyne, op. cit., col. 2566.

[5] Knight, op. cit., p. 50; Robert and Tricot, Guide to the Bible, I, p. 506f.

[6] E.g., R. H. Pfeiffer, "Midrash in the Books of Samuel," Quantalacumque, pp. 303-316.

[7] Hermann L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, p. 6.

It is used also to identify a *Gattung*.[1] This last usage is our special concern here. Since the understanding of midrash as a *Gattung* is not necessarily self-evident, we are compelled to investigate its validity. A brief survey of the history of the word may be helpful.

Etymologically derived from the verbal root דרש ('seek,' 'inquire')[2] the noun midrash appears only twice in the OT: II Chronicles 13:22 and 24:27. These, the earliest known occurrences of the word, are perhaps to be dated in the fourth century B.C.[3] Although their exact meaning in context is uncertain,[4] they both refer to sources or commentaries which the Chronicler used. In the Apocryphal literature the word midrash occurs only once. Ecclesiasticus (c 180 B.C.)[5] records that the sage Ben Sirah invited students to come to him for instructions and to "lodge in the *beth ha-midrash*" (51:23). This phrase is a technical term for a house of exegesis, a school where students gathered to be taught the meaning of Scripture. In rabbinic writings of the post-biblical and Talmudic periods the word midrash is very common.[6] During this time the midrash was developed and used most extensively.

Rabbinic midrash exhibits the following characteristics:[7] (1) It always has its point of departure in a portion of Scripture. (2) It is based upon an attentive study of the biblical text chosen. (3) It comments or expounds upon this text in a didactic or homiletical fashion. (4) It adapts the meaning of the Scripture to an immediate situation. (5) While it may take the form of legal material (*halakah*), most often it is fashioned as narrative (*haggadah*). (6) Above all the narrative proclaims the miraculous power of God.

---

[1] E.g., Renée Bloch, "Midrash," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplement 5, col. 1263.

[2] BDB, p. 205; KB, 497.

[3] W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, p. X.

[4] Strack, *op. cit.*, p. 6 and p. 239 n.36.

[5] C. C. Torrey, *The Apocryphal Literature*, p. 94.

[6] Strack, *op. cit.*, *passim*. Cf. S. Horovitz, "Midrash," JE VIII, pp. 548-550.

[7] R. Bloch, *op. cit.*, col. 1265f; cf. Strack, *op. cit.*, esp. pp. 201-205; N. Glatzer, ed., *Hammer on the Rock*, p. 5f and *passim*.

The *raison d'etre* for midrash was probably the need to state the ancient traditions of Israel in a way which would be meaningful and relevant to post-exilic conditions.[1] The new circumstances of the post-exilic and post-biblical eras[2] required a new expression of the old teachings. This re-statement of the faith consisted chiefly in tales which exalted the acts of God.

It would be a mistake to assume that the midrash as developed by the Rabbis was completely unrelated to pre-exilic literature. The concept behind the word midrash may be much older than the earliest appearances of the word itself. R. Bloch maintains that the origin of midrash is inseparable from the formation of Scripture itself.[3] Its beginnings are to be sought in those portions of the OT where the prophets refer to their predecessors: e.g., Jeremiah adapts Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah to his situation in the sixth century; Ezekiel builds upon all of these prophets and also upon the Holiness Code. Thus, within the OT itself ancient Scripture is frequently re-stated to become relevant for a new age. The continuation and accentuation of this early tendency into the post-exilic period produces the narratives called Midrashim.

---

[1] Loretz, *op. cit.*, p. 26ff.

[2] For a discussion of the post-exilic and talmudic periods, see Salo W. Baron and Joseph L. Blau, "Introduction," *Judaism*, pp. xi-xxvi.

[3] Bloch, *op. cit.*, cols. 1267-1271.

Having surveyed the origin, development, and meaning of midrash, we consider now whether or not the term legitimately designates a _Gattung_. Scholars are divided on this issue. Keller asserts flatly that the term does not designate a _Gattung_ in the OT.[1] E. Gross understands the midrash as a body of material which itself exists in a surprising multiplicity of _Gattungen_.[2] Bentzen, Weiser, and Eissfeldt do not include midrash in their respective discussions of the literary forms of the OT. The absence of the term need not mean, however, that these critics do not regard midrash as a type of literature. It may only mean that they consider the term post-biblical and hence outside the scope of their classifications. Their silence permits us to draw no conclusions whatsoever. Numerous other scholars do define midrash as a literary form. Representative of this group are Robert and Tricot, who describe midrash as a literary genre which is a narrative "developed out of Scriptural fact or event for the purpose of inculcating an edifying lesson."[3] On the whole, there is no compelling reason to reject the view that midrash is a literary type. Surely the word does describe a kind of literature which has its own distinctive characteristics. In this sense midrash is a _Gattung_. Yet this

---

[1] Keller, _op_. _cit_., p. 183, n.8.

[2] E. Gross, "Midrash," RGG^4, col. 940.

[3] Robert and Tricot, _op_. _cit_., p. 345. For similar definitions of midrash, see Eiselen, _op_. _cit_., p. 459, n.55; Evans, _op_. _cit_., p. 44; Bloch, _op_. _cit_., col. 1263; cf. Glatzer, _op_. _cit_., p. 6.

Gattung is a broad classification which may itself be broken down into more specific types, be they parables, allegories, legends, folk-tales, *etc*. Bearing this fact in mind, we consider now the appropriateness of the *Gattung* midrash for *Jonah*.

Karl Budde is usually credited with being the first to call *Jonah* a midrash.[1] With variations other scholars have also adopted this designation.[2] In many ways the description seems most fitting: *Jonah* is a didactic story which makes great use of the imagination as it points out the miraculous acts of Yahweh in bringing about His purposes. What remains to be determined is whether the book is a commentary upon some portion of Scripture.

Taking his clue from the mention in II Chronicles 24:27 of a midrash on the book of Kings, Budde observes that outside the book of *Jonah* the prophet Jonah is referred to only in II Kings 14:25. There as the prophet of Yahweh Jonah is allied with the expansion of Israel's borders under Jeroboam II. Noticing further that *Jonah* has no superscription - that it begins and ends abruptly as if to indicate that it is part of a larger whole - Budde concludes that the book was originally a section of the Midrash of Kings and that it came after II Kings 14:27.[3] He argues that since the prophet Jonah in Kings has warm words for the sinful king-

666

---

[1] K. Budde, "Vermutungen zum 'Midrasch des Buches der Könige'," *ZAW* 11 (1892), pp. 37-51; also Budde, *JE*, p. 228f.

[2] In addition to those scholars mentioned already, the following also recognize the midrashic character of *Jonah*: Winckler (p. 260); Wellhausen (p. 211); C. Steuernagel (*Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das AT*, p. 442); Bewer (p. 9); Feuillet ("Le Livre," p. 18); A. R. Gordon (p. 350); Loretz (p. 26ff); Delcor (pp. 268f; 273f).

[3] Budde's view is accepted by R. F. Horton, *The Minor Prophets*, p. 198; see also J. Steinmann, *Le Livre de Consolation*, p. 286.

dom of Israel, it is easy to see how a midrash would extend this mercy to foreigners.

There is no positive evidence for the relationship which Budde tries to establish between the books of Kings and _Jonah_. Other than the name of the prophet, there is no specific connection between the content of our _Büchlein_ and the passage in Kings. From a literary viewpoint _Jonah_ would be an awkward insertion in Kings. Moreover, the character of the Midrash of Kings, as alluded to in Chronicles, does not resemble the kind of material which we have in _Jonah_. For these reasons, then, _Jonah_ can hardly be a midrash which was originally attached to II Kings. Nevertheless, Budde's suggestion is not to be dismissed _in toto_. The historical prophet Jonah may well have been one point of departure for this story about him. In other words, the book of _Jonah_ may have been inspired in part by the historical _Jonah_, even though as a midrash the book is not a commentary on II Kings 14:25ff.

Besides Budde's theory several other suggestions have been made as to that portion of Scripture upon which _Jonah_ comments.[1] On the basis of a thorough study of the biblical sources of _Jonah_,[2] Feuillet maintains that the book is a commentary on many different parts of the OT, especially those sections of Jeremiah and Ezekiel which focus on the nature of prophetic decrees directed against foreign nations.[3] These decrees are always pronounced as absolute, but nevertheless they always remain conditional

---

[1] In passing we mention Winckler's theory (which he later retracted) that _Jonah_ belongs to the Midrash of the reign of Manasseh and was written to explain why the prophecy of Nahum was not fulfilled ("Zum buche Jona," AF, p. 260ff). See the relevant criticisms by Bewer, _op. cit._, p. 9f.

[2] Feuillet, "Le Livre," p. 15ff; "Les Sources du livre de Jonas," _RB_ 54 (1947), 161-186.

[3] See esp. Jer. 18:7-8; 25:5; 26:3; 36; Ezekiel 26-28.

(cf. esp. Jon. 3:3,10). Agreeing with Feuillet, Robert and Tricot comment that _Jonah_ is "a herald of midrashic literature, for its author, who had an amazing knowledge of earlier books of Scripture, employed them constantly to serve a carefully thought out doctrinal purpose."[1] More specifically Knight claims that _Jonah_ is a midrash upon sections of Jeremiah and Second Isaiah.[2] He cites passages in Jeremiah which speak of Israel being swallowed by Babylonia (51:34,44) as the basis for the story of the fish.[3] The rest of the book is a commentary upon the themes of monotheism and of universalism which are proclaimed by Second Isaiah.

No doubt there is a certain validity in these suggestions. _Jonah_ is indeed packed with allusions to other parts of Scripture. Yet to conclude that it is a midrash upon these many allusions is perhaps to overlook one central characteristic of a midrash. As a commentary the midrash expounds explicitly on a text of Scripture. That text is evident in the midrash itself. It is not merely alluded to; it does not have to be searched out. So these suggestions outlined above seem to miss the mark when they fail to see that _Jonah_ tells us quite clearly upon what specific theme of Scripture it is commenting. There is no need to seek a text among the many biblical allusions in _Jonah_. In addition to these allusions _Jonah_ provides us with an explicit text. In Chapter 1 we know that Jonah's flight is an act of disobedience to the word of Yahweh. Not until after the salvation of Nineveh, however, are we told why Jonah disobeys:

> And he /Jonah/ prayed to the Lord and said, "I pray thee, Lord,

---

[1] Robert and Tricot, _op. cit._, p. 506. For a criticism of Feuillet's thesis, see Loretz, _op. cit._, pp. 25ff.

[2] Knight, _op. cit._, p. 52.

[3] See also Hanson, _op. cit._, p. 12, and Evans, _op. cit._, p. 48f.

> is not this what I said when I was yet in my country? That is why I made haste to flee to Tarshish; for I knew that thou art a gracious God and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love, and repentest of evil." (4:2)

Embedded in this prayer of Jonah is a confession of faith which may perhaps be traced all the way back to the Exodus traditions (cf. Ex. 34:66f JE).[1] It is the proclamation that Yahweh is a God of love and of mercy. It is found with variations in Num. 14:18, Deut. 7:8ff, Neh. 9:17, Joel 2:13, Pss. 86:5,15; 103:8; 111:4; and 145:8. The author of Jonah has taken over this proclamation, in one of its forms, as the text upon which he wishes to comment. As a method of teaching he has fashioned around this text a miraculous story which extols the acts of Yahweh. In Jonah an ancient credo is re-stated anew. This credo provides the major key for understanding the message of the book. To this message we shall return later. Suffice it here to conclude that midrash is a most appropriate Gattung for Jonah. The book is a commentary upon a portion of Scripture. It expands this Scripture in didactic and dialogic fashion.[2] It makes great use of the imagination as it recounts the miraculous acts of Yahweh in bringing about His purposes.

As we have already pointed out, however, the Gattung of midrash is a broad classification. We must further determine what kind of midrash Jonah is. To this task we turn, as we consider the legendary character of the book.

---

[1] JE, according to Driver (Introduction, p. 38), although other scholars are not so certain of this classification. See the survey in R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f," VT XII (Jan. 1963), 36f.

[2] See Glatzer, op. cit., p. 5f.

(4) Legend

The classic analysis of biblical legends (Sagen) is another of Gunkel's contributions to Form Criticism. Although he specialized in the study of legends in Genesis,[1] Gunkel also took into account other sections of the OT where this Gattung is present. Specifically he identified Jonah as a legend[2] - a designation with which many other scholars concur.[3] An examination of legend as a literary form shows the aptness of this designation for Jonah.

The legend is a narrative which embraces both fact and fiction. Within its bounds one may find history, myth, and folk-tale interwined. Legend is not to be identified with any one of these other forms; it can be distinguished from each of them. Nevertheless, it is related positively to all of them, and perhaps it is best described in relationship to them.

It is a popular misconception that a legend is a fanciful story which at its best reflects dubious historical fact. Legend is misunderstood as the antithesis of history. Actually both legend and history are ways of preserving events, stories, happenings; they are both concerned with and centered in Geschichte. Geschichte may be recorded, on the one hand, in the form of historiography and, on the other hand, in the form of poetic recollection. In the OT these two categories are not completely separate or opposed. Historiography emerges from legend,[4] and the roots of legend lie in historical reality.[1] In his comparison of these forms of literature,[2] Gunkel noted that originally the legend was an oral composition whereas history was usually written. Legend has a personal and private character which is interested in common people and events, whereas history is more concerned with public happenings. The material of legend is fashioned partly by tradition and partly by imagination.[3] It does not purport to inform us literally of happenings, but rather it aims to please and inspire us by its poetic understanding of an event.[4] The core of legend is historical, no matter to how great an extent that reality has been embellished by imagination.

---

[1] H. Gunkel, Genesis.

[2] "There is no denying that there are legends in the OT; consider for instance the stories of Samson and of Jonah." Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, p. 3.

[3] With individual variations, Eichhorn, Ewald, Sellin, Bleeker, Hylmö, Bentzen, Gaster, Kaufmann, Buber, Kuhl, Weiser, and Westermann call Jonah a legend. See also Steurnagel (Einleitung, p. 442); Vatke (Historisch-Kritische Einleitung, p. 686); DeWette (Critical and Historical Introduction, p. 452f); Hölscher (Die Profeten, p. 437).

[4] See Bentzen, op. cit., p. 243ff.

Just as the _Gattung_ of legend has a positive connection with history, so it may be related positively to myth and to fairy-tale. As we have seen, myths were transformed in the faith of Israel. In the OT stories about the gods are absent and the realm of nature is subordinate to the world of history. Yahweh alone is God, and He is portrayed in living relationship to his people and their history. Through this transformation myth assumes the character of legend. An historicized myth becomes a legend. Conversely, then, certain biblical legends may be derived from myths.[5] Like the myth, the folk-tale is not altogether a suitable form for biblical material. Fanciful and magical stories are _per se_ not a medium through which historical revelation can be expressed.[1] Hence, as Bentzen avers, folk-tale motifs in the OT appear in "strong conjunction with legendary elements and perhaps with historical reminiscences."[2] As she historicized the myth, so Israel modified the folk-tale. She transformed the floating nature of *Märchen* by tying it to particular people, places, and events. She transformed an entertaining story to become a vehicle for proclaiming the word of Yahweh. This transformation resulted in the creation of types of legends. The presence of folk-tale motifs in legends does not modify the character of legends; rather these motifs may exist as an integral part of legend.[3] As a literary form the legend is an absorber and transformer of other *Gattungen*. It may embrace and combine seemingly alien forms. It is a narrative which takes unto itself history, myth, and folk-tale.[4]

---

[1] Cf. von Rad, _Genesis_, p. 31.

[2] See Gunkel, _The Legends of Genesis_, pp. 3-11.

[3] "The clearest criterion of legend is that it frequently reports things which are quite incredible" (_Ibid._, p. 7).

[4] von Rad, _op. cit._, p. 32ff.

[5] Gunkel, _The Legends of Genesis_, pp. 14-18; 119f.

These observations about the nature of biblical legends provide a helpful perspective for understanding the *Gattung* of *Jonah*. In 1:1 we are confronted with an historical person. Jonah, son of Amittai, lived in the first half of the eighth century B.C. at a time immediately prior to the emergence of Assyria as the strongest nation in the ancient world.[5] Why this historical prophet is the central human character in our story is difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain. It has been proposed that the historical Jonah may have actually prophesied concerning Assyria,[1] - or have refused so to prophesy[2] - and hence he would have been an appropriate choice for a non-historical story about Nineveh.[3] There is no proof for this conjecture. The only recorded prophecy attributed to the historical Jonah concerns the expansion of Israel's boundaries under Jeroboam II (II Kings 14:25). Historically this territorial expansion was made possible in part by the weakening of Damascus, a condition which in turn was brought about by Assyrian power.[4] But the prophecy does not mention Assyria. Thus, we are unable to determine why the historical Jonah is the prophet of our story.

---

[1] See *supra* on the folk-tale.

[2] Bentzen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 241.   [3] von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[4] See Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition*, note 11 on p. 101; "Legend," IDB^{3}, p. 108ff.

[5] For discussions of the history of this period, see Bright, *A History of Israel*, p. 238ff and Noth, *The History of Israel*, p. 247ff.

Theological reasons have been proposed, but they are not decisive. Some critics who believe that *Jonah* is a polemic against the nationalism of post-exilic Israel note that Jonah's prophecy in Kings is extremely nationalistic in tone and in content. It seems to identify the will of Yahweh with the growth of the state of Israel and clearly marks Jonah as a tool of the ambitious Jeroboam II. Unlike his contemporary Amos, Jonah is a cheerful prophet of victory who supports the nationalistic policies of the established regime.[5] Accordingly it is argued that this Jonah was selected most appropriately to exemplify the spirit of nationalism in the book of Jonah.

---

[1] D. O. Procksch, *Die Kleinen Prophetischen Schriften nach dem Exil*, p. 88.

[2] R. W. Dale, "Jonah," *Expositor*, p. 3ff; cf. Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, p. 494.

[3] Sellin goes beyond this proposal to suggest that the eighth century Jonah may have actually gone to Nineveh. He cites as parallels the journeys of Elijah and Elisha to Syria (*Introduction*, p. 173). Lippl concurs, *op. cit.*, p. 163; cf. also Sellin-Rost, *Einleitung*, p. 127; Goitein, "Some Observations on Jonah," JPOS, 74f; Ewald, *Commentary*, p. 92.

[4] Noth, *op. cit.*, p. 248.

[5] C. H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament*, p. 219f.

This proposal may be attacked from two directions. First, it is not established that Jonah is a polemic against nationalism.[1] Our examination of the book as a midrash indicates that the main emphasis lies elsewhere: the love of God. To be sure this love is manifested toward a foreign people, but Jonah's anger does not stem from the fact that Nineveh qua Nineveh is saved. There is no clear evidence that the prophet is pro-Israel and anti-Nineveh. Basically he resents the divine love which is shown to the city. Yet the source of his anger is not devotion to his own nation but the knowledge that Yahweh repents of evil. The issue of nationalism *versus* universalism is dependent upon the central proclamation of the love of God. Thus the book of Jonah transcends any polemic against nationalism.

A second weakness in the proposal is the fact that the passage in II Kings is not indisputably a statement of nationalism. It does portray the historical Jonah as favoring the expansion of the Kingdom of Israel. Yet this expansion need not be a form of nationalism. It is possible to interpret it as an expression of concern for those who, since the time of Solomon, had lived outside the community of Israel.[2] From this vantage point it may be claimed that Jonah inspired Jeroboam II to embrace those beyond his kingdom; thereby what has been called nationalism on the part of this Jonah is actually a kind of universalism! When the prophecy of II Kings 14:26 is read in its larger context (vs 23-27), it becomes clear that the prophet Jonah is regarded by the Deuteronomic historian not as a tool of Jeroboam II but as a spokesman of Yahweh. In spite of the fact that Jeroboam "did what was evil in the sight of the Lord," nevertheless Yahweh worked through him to restore the border of Israel and to save his people from destruction (vs 26-27).[1] Thus the expansion of the kingdom is presented not as nationalistic growth but as the fulfillment of the divine will in history.[2] In II Kings Jonah is not a spokesman for nationalism but a true prophet of the word of Yahweh.

---

[1] See Chapter IV for further discussion of the ideas stated in this paragraph.

[2] T. H. Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year*, p. 177.

However one interprets Jonah and II Kings 14:25, these passages do not provide us with precise reasons why the historical Jonah is the prophet in our non-historical story. We cannot even determine whether Jonah was the inspiration for our legend or whether he was associated with the story after its original formulation. Just as legends grew around the activities of Elijah and Elisha, so our story may have grown out of some incident(s) in the life of Jonah[3] (if so, we do not know what this incident was). Over a period of time this incident was embellished considerably by mythological and folk-tale motifs.[4] Conversely, the book of Jonah may have originally existed as a folk-tale independent of the prophet Jonah.[5] This tale was then re-worked by a Hebrew story-teller who associated it with the prophet Jonah for didactic purposes. In either case we do not know why Jonah, rather than someone else, is the prophet in the story. All we can say with certainty is that in some way and to some extent our book has an historical nucleus in this eighth-century prophet.

---

[1] See O. Baab, Theology of the Old Testament, p. 115f.

[2] On the relationship of the word of Yahweh to the events of history in the book of Kings, see von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, pp. 74-91.

[3] See Weiser, Einleitung, p. 203; Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel, p. 284; Sellin, Introduction, p. 173; Sellin-Rost, Einleitung, p. 127f.

[4] See Weiser and Sellin supra; also Dale, op. cit., esp. p. 4.

[5] Gaster, op. cit., p. 176.

There is possibly a second historical note in the book, though a minor one. Tarshish, Joppa, and Nineveh were all important cities in the ancient world. Unlike the perennial folk-tale, our story is not set in a far-off land which is unknown or unidentified. Our author did not choose to use fictitious places. He tied the travels of Jonah as well as the mission of the prophet to well-known localities. Obviously he did not employ these geographical references as historical documentation. Had this been his intention, he would have told us where Jonah was when Yahweh first spoke (1:1) and upon what dry land the fish vomited the prophet (2:11). Yet it is notable in light of the character of a legend that the places specifically mentioned in Jonah are historical. Most important of the three is Nineveh. While it is a legendary city in our tale, some of the information given about it may also be historically verifiable.[1] The greatness of the city in the ancient world is well attested.[2] The references to its evil (1:2) and to its violence (3:8), though unspecified, can be documented from Assyrian annals.[3] The statement that three days were required to cross the city (3:3) need not be an exaggeration at all.[1] The "greater Nineveh" of the ancient world included 'the Assyrian triangle' which stretched from Khorsabad to Nimrud. If Nineveh is regarded in this sense, then the measurement[2] cited in Jonah is quite realistic. The greater city was large enough to require three days for crossing it.

---

[1] For a succinct account of the history of Nineveh in relationship to biblical times, see André Parrot, Nineveh and the Old Testament.

[2] See B. Mazar, ed., Views of the Biblical World, Vol. 3, p. 253.

[3] Parrot, op. cit., p. 30ff and Pritchard, ANET, p. 274ff. Cf. also the book of Nahum; cf. Brockington, op. cit., p. 627. But it is important not to exaggerate Assyrian atrocities, as some ancient and modern writers have been inclined to do. The Assyrians were no more cruel and violent than were many other peoples of history; see esp. A. T. Olmstead, History of Assyria, pp. 645-655.

The above items re-enforce our contention that there is a historical nucleus to the clearly non-historical book of Jonah. This nucleus consists in two points: (1) the prophet Jonah and (2) the cities mentioned, especially Nineveh. The presence of this nucleus may be one indication that the Gattung of Jonah is legend. In addition, there is the possibility of a mythological motif in the story of the fish, and there are many Märchen motifs throughout the entire narrative. The amalgamation of these diverse motifs - historical, mythical, and folkloristic - can legitimately be encompassed under the category of legend. As a literary form, legend embraces and identifies the heterogeneous character of Jonah.

4. Conclusion

Our survey of the many Gattungen proposed for Jonah points up sharply the elusive nature of this little book. With certainty we can say that the story is not history. Some of the non-historical Gattungen we are able to dismiss as inadequate. Two designations which are frequently applied to Jonah, namely allegory and parable, we eliminated as unsuitable. Three others - myth, fable, and folk-tale - we found to be only partial identifications. Of these three folk-tale merits the most serious consideration because it does aptly describe many of the episodes in the book. It fails, however, to account for historical, didactic, and theological elements. Its inadequacy at these crucial points is indicative of its general inadequacy as a Gattung in OT studies. Nevertheless, it ought to be emphasized that the category of Märchen sheds considerable light on the book of Jonah. In many ways it helps us to understand the kind of story which we are reading and to interpret it correctly.

---

[1] Parrot, op. cit., pp. 85-86; T. H. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 123-125.

[2] For a discussion of the biblical practice of indicating distances by days of marching, see de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 198.

The last two Gattungen which we considered - midrash and legend - are deemed appropriate for Jonah. In its present form the book is a fanciful commentary upon a theme in Scripture; it extols the miraculous acts of God. Since midrashim were not prevalent until post-biblical and Talmudic times, Jonah is one of our earliest known specimens of this form. To call the book a midrash seems altogether fitting but not altogether precise. Midrashim themselves appear in a variety of forms. Therefore, we sought to discover what kind of midrash Jonah is and found it to be a legend.

C. Literary Characteristics

Form criticism is concerned not only with identifying the form of a unit but also with describing the character of that form. A composition is first assigned to a class of literature; then the literary characteristics of that composition are studied. There are two kinds of characteristics: a) those which are common to a given Gattung; b) those which are peculiar to an individual representative of that Gattung. Our concern here is with the Gattung of legend. In this connection we must bear in mind two facts: a) All legends share certain literary features; b) each legend has its own unique properties.

Both sets of characteristics must be studied if the Tendenz of a narrative is to become clear. The form in which an author weaves his tale is no small clue to an understanding of the story. The particular words which he chooses, the way in which he uses them, where he places them, how he groups them to form phrases, sentences, and larger complexes - all these features lead us to the very heart of the matter; to the meaning of the text.[1]

What has been generally affirmed in these introductory remarks will be specifically confirmed in our examination of the literary characteristics of Jonah.

1. Jonah as Legend

Brevity and simplicity are distinctive marks of the Sage.[2] These terms aptly describe the extent of a legend, the nature of its narration, including the portrayal of characters, and the nature of its dialogues. Whereas some legends may be expanded in their present forms, they yet show signs of their original brevity. It is again the merit of Gunkel that he has succeeded in isolating many of these original units and in laying bare their literary features.[3]

In its present form Jonah is relatively short. Its forty verses contain no superfluous material. The story begins in medias res and ends just as abruptly. There is no attempt to introduce the narrative and no effort to conclude it gradually. The very first verse plunges us immediately into the story, and the very last suddenly breaks it off. Yahweh's word commands Jonah (1:1); Yahweh's word questions Jonah (4:10-11).

---

[1] See Muilenburg, The Way of Israel, p. 18f.

[2] Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, pp. 46-48.

[3] Our aim in this section is to set forth those general literary characteristics of a Sage which are present in Jonah. To accomplish this aim we draw upon Gunkel's classic description of the Sage as given in The Legends of Genesis, pp. 46-79.

To recognize the relative briefness of our present narrative is to become aware of what must have been the extreme brevity of the legend proper. The present composition is short; the original legend must have been even shorter. This fact is suggested by the amalgamation of *Gattungen* which form our unit. We have seen that within *Jonah* mythological, folkloristic, midrashic, and legendary features are present. Singling out these elements allows us to penetrate behind our present composition to the preliterary development of the story. These elements show us that our present narrative is not the original legend. Diverse pieces have been brought together to form this unit. To expect to distinguish the exact extent and precise content of the originally separate pieces is to exceed the reasonable limits of our methodology. These pieces are woven together so skillfully in our present composition that it is no longer possible to sort them out with accuracy. While they may be pointed to, they cannot be clearly defined. It is futile, then, to search for "*the* original core" of the book of *Jonah*.[1] We have no sure way of determining exactly what is the original essence of the legend. But we do know that the present story is an expanded legend. Behind this single composition lies a period of oral transmission and development in which diverse Gattungen have been carefully and artistically assimilated to form a literary and theological whole. Thus the original legend was even much shorter than our present brief story.

---

[1] A case in point is the view of Kuhl (*The OT: Its Origins and Composition*, p. 210f). Having assigned *Jonah* to the "literary genre of prophetic legend", Kuhl observes that originally the book was composed of many different pieces added at different times. Then he proceeds to pinpoint these pieces: Chapters 3 and 4 contain the legend proper. Chapters 1 and 2 (excluding the Psalm) are composed of "old material of Märchen and myth" which was assimilated to the legend. Kuhl's view is questionable, since there is legendary material in Chapter 1 and Märchen material in Chapters 3 and 4. It is virtually impossible so to isolate the traditions behind our composition. See the remarks of Weiser on this matter in *The OT*, p. 251.

The brevity which marks the extent of our legend also characterizes its content. The author does not give us elaborate explanations or detailed descriptions of what is happening. He includes only that material which is essential for his immediate purposes. Perhaps the best way to stress this point is to list possible narrative which does not appear in the story. We are not told, for instance, where, how, or when Yahweh's call came to Jonah; what the sins of the Ninevites were; how much Jonah paid for his passage on ship; who the sailors were and from where they came; why Jonah went to sleep; whether or not Jonah prayed according to the order of the captain; what vows the sailors made; what kind of fish swallowed Jonah; on what dry land Jonah was ejected; how Jonah reached Nineveh; how Nineveh would be destroyed; who the king of Nineveh was; what happened to Nineveh after this episode; what finally happened to Jonah, etc. Enough omissions have been cited to point up the conciseness of our story. Superfluous information is simply not included. Both narration and dialogue are brief and to the point. There are no digressions. No words are placed on the lips of people unless they contribute directly to the action of the story. Through noting omissions we are made aware of the importance of what is actually given. The author has "judiciously selected" his material.[1] What is narrated is ipso facto of great significance.

---

[1] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 68.

The portrayal of characters in a legend is simple. A small number of people are involved, and of them only a few are depicted as individuals.[1] Jonah himself is our only character who emerges as a person. Apart from him, the captain does stand in contrast to the anonymous crew of the ship, and the king of Nineveh is singled out from among the citizens of the city. Yet neither the captain nor the king is clearly depicted as an individual. As Gunkel observes,[2] fashioners of legends are more adept at presenting types of people than at describing individuals. Jonah is the type of a disobedient prophet,[3] or perhaps the type of a disobedient Israelite;[4] the sailors are a type of foreigners;[5] Nineveh is the type of an ancient city of wickedness;[6] the king of Nineveh is the type of an

---

[1] Cf., e.g., the cycle of Joseph stories (Gen. 38ff) in which only three or four of the nine brothers stand forth as individuals. Cf. also the ark stories in I Sam. 4-6 and II Sam. 6.

[2] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 55ff.

[3] Cf. Elijah as the type of an obedient prophet (I Kings 17ff).

[4] See H. W. Wolff, "Jonabuch," col. 854.

[5] Cf. the Philistine foreigners in the ark stories of I. Sam. 4-6. They remain anonymous. From among them emerge their unnamed princes and priests, much as the unnamed captain stands forth from the sailors in Jonah.

[6] It is particularly interesting to compare Nineveh with Sodom and Gomorrah, which are also types of ancient cities (Gen. 18:16ff J). In both legends Yahweh condemns the cities because of their wickedness. In both legends He is willing to spare the cities from destruction if they show signs of righteousness. In the Jonah legend the entire city of Nineveh repents, and thus Yahweh saves it. In the Genesis legend not even ten righteous men can be found in Sodom, and thus Yahweh destroys it (Gen. 19:24). In both stories, then, the themes of sin-repentance-forgiveness are of central concern, and the character of Yahweh's activity is similar. The startling contrast lies in the differing attitudes of Yahweh's servants: Abraham pleads for the salvation of Sodom; Jonah wills the destruction of Nineveh. Ironically, in each case the outcome is precisely the reverse of the human wish. Abraham accepts the divine decision; Jonah fights it.

Oriental monarch.[1] As types the characters of this legend stand forth with clarity; as individuals they are obscured in haze.

Not all of the characters appear in the story simultaneously. The captain and the crew of Chapter 1 have no contact at all with the king and the Ninevites of Chapter 3. Within Chapter 1 itself the characters do not come together. When the captain questions Jonah, these two are below deck, and the sailors are above. When the sailors question Jonah, the captain is not in evidence. Nowhere in this scene is there a cluttering of people or a complex portrayal of their relationship. This particular feature testifies to the essential simplicity of the legend. It is accentuated even more in the remainder of the story where no two human characters are presented together. The fish episode involves Jonah alone. The scene in Nineveh is narrated without any dialogue among Jonah, the Ninevites, and the king. First Jonah alone is treated (3:1-3;4:5); next the actions of the Ninevites are described (3:4); then the action of the king is recorded (3:6ff). There is no actual meeting of these characters. To detect interaction one must read between the lines. In the final scene of the legend (Chapter 4) Jonah alone talks with Yahweh; no other human character is involved.

The lack of psychological analyses of the characters also contributes to the basic clarity and conciseness of the legend. "Only a few traits are ascribed to them, often but one."[2] We are told only that the mariners are afraid (1:5,10); that Jonah is exceedingly angry (4:1)[3] or very happy (4:6). We are not given a lengthy look into the inner life of Jonah, the mariners, or the Ninevites. This absence of "psychologizing" does not mean that the narrator is unaware of the inner feelings of his characters. It only indicates a different method of portraying characters. Legends were originally oral; thus emotions might well be imparted in the actual telling of the story which are not explicitly expressed in the text.[1] Moreover, in a legend action replaces descriptive passages and psychological analyses.[2] It is action which reveals the inward feelings of people. For instance, the rebellion, disobedience, and anger of Jonah are part and parcel of his efforts to flee from Yahweh. His attitude is presented not by internal probings but via dialogue and activity. The fear of the sailors is known through what they do: they cry to their gods, throw their wares overboard (1:5), cast lots (1:4), bombard Jonah with questions (1:8,11), row furiously to return to shore (1:13), and finally throw Jonah into the sea (1:15). The repentent attitude of the Ninevites is again a matter of what they do rather than of what they think or feel: they fast, put on sackcloth, cry to God (3:5-8) - and God sees their deeds (3:10). "It is chiefly this admirable act of indirectly depicting men through their actions which makes the legends so vivid."[3] Nowhere does the story bog down in descriptions. It moves forward through events. Action, not analysis, is the legend's distinctive feature.

---

[1] Cf. the Pharaoh in the Abraham stories (Gen. 12:10-20 J), whose sensitivity to the divine will is not unlike that of the king of Nineveh. Both monarchs reveal a righteousness not found in Yahweh's own servants Abraham and Jonah.

[2] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 53.

[3] Cf. the simple statement in Gen. 4:5b: "So Cain was very angry...."

The simplicity of a legend does not mean that it is lacking in sustained interest. Quite the contrary. Elements of suspense and excitement permeate the entire narrative. We do not know at the start what the resolution will be. No clue is provided in an early section of the story as to the development of a later section. Events are told only as they happen; they are not disclosed in advance.[1] Hence we have no warnings of the consequences of Jonah's flight. Throughout Chapter 1 we are left to wonder why Jonah fled and how the story will end. In Chapter 3 we wait to see what will happen to Nineveh. Chapter 4 is the product of suspense-building on the part of the author. Curiosity is evoked as we wonder how Yahweh will deal with the anger of Jonah. This curiosity increases when first the plant appears, then a worm, the wind, and the sun. Yet the listener still does not know the resolution of the story. He must wait for Yahweh's final words. Even then he is surprised, for this last question is hardly the expected conclusion. The legend "ends" with an unanswered question! Throughout our relatively brief and simple story, then, runs a thread of sustained interest which Gunkel calls the _sine qua non_ of every legend.

---

[1] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 62. [2] Delcor, "Jonas," p. 281.

[3] Gunkel, op. cit., p. 62.

2. External Design

a. Introduction

In our discussion of the diverse _Gattungen_ represented in _Jonah_ we noted the impossibility of determining precisely their original extent and content. One factor contributing to this impossibility is the artistic arrangement of the present composition. The book has been constructed very carefully so that there is an over-all balance and symmetry. A number of scholars have called attention to this symmetry,[2] but to our knowledge no one has demonstrated it throughout in detail.

---

[1] Consider, e.g., the building of suspense in the legend of the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. 22) and in the story of Elijah and the Contest on Mt. Carmel (I Kings 18).

[2] See Döller, _Das Buch Jona_, p. 35; Baudissin, _Einleitung_, p. 595;

Jonah is divided into two major sections of approximately equal length. The first section consists of Chapters 1 and 2:1,2,11; the second consists of Chapters 3 and 4. The evidence for this division is the repetition of 1:1 in 3:1, where we are told that "the word of Yahweh came to Jonah a second time" (שנית). The fact that 3:1 is patterned after 1:1 is a clue that the design of Chapters 1 and 2 is being repeated.[1] Moreover, the word שנית is frequently employed in the OT to indicate the second of two parallel passages. In Genesis 22:15 it introduces the second command of the angel to Abraham; in I Kings 19:7 the second command to Elijah; and in Jeremiah 13:3 the second command concerning the linen waistcloth (cf. also Jer. 33:1). In Genesis 41:5 the word שנית introduces the second of Pharaoh's dreams and in Jeremiah 1:13 the second of parallel visions. The presence of this word in Jonah 3:1 is likewise a sign of parallel passages. This parallelism is primarily a correspondence between the themes of the two sections. In addition, words and phrases are sometimes repeated verbatim.

The following chart shows in detail the symmetrical arrangement of *Jonah*.

Feuillet, "Le Sens du Livre de Jonas," RB 54 (1947), 333; Young, *Introduction*, p. 257; von Rad, "Der Prophet Jona," p. 9; Lohfink, "Jona ging zur Stadt hinaus (Jon. 4,5)," BZ 5/2 (July, 1961), 201.

[1] Gunkel, "Jonabuch," col. 366; Lohfink, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

b. The Book of Jonah: A Study in Symmetry

Section A: Jonah 1 and 2:1,2,11	Section B: Jonah 3 and 4
1. The word of Yahweh to Jonah (1:1)	**1. The word of Yahweh to Jonah (3:1)**
ויה דבר־יהוה אל־יונה בן־אמתי לאמר:	ויהי דבר־יהוה אל־יונה שנית לאמר:
2. The content of the word (1:2)	**2. The content of the word (3:2)**
קום לך אל־נינוה העיר הגדולה וקרא עליה כי־ עלתה רעתם לפני:	קום לך אל־נינוה העיר הגדולה וקרא אליה את־ הקריאה אשר אנכי דבר אליך:
3. The response of Jonah (1:3)	**3. The response of Jonah (3:3-4a)**
ויקם יונה לברח תרשישה מלפני יהוה וירד יפו וימצא אניה באה תרשיש ויתן שכרה וירד בה לבוא עמהם תרשישה מלפני יהוה:	ויקם יונה וילך אל־נינוה כדבר יהוה ונינוה היתה עיר־גדולה לאלהים מהלך שלשת ימים: ויחל יונה לבוא בעיר מהלך יום אחד

4. A pronouncement of doom (1:4)	**4. A pronouncement of doom (3:4b)**
ויהוה הטיל רוח־גדולה אל־הים ויהי סער־גדול בים והאניה חשבה להשבר:	ויקרא ויאמר עוד ארבעים יום ונינוה נהפכת:
5. The response of the sailors to threatened disaster (1:5ab)	**5. The response of Jonah to threatened disaster (4:5)**
וייראו המלחים ויזעקו איש אל־אלהיו ויטלו את־ הכלים אשר באניה אל־הים להקל מעליהם	ויצא יונה מן־העיר וישב מקדם לעיר ויעש לו שם סכה וישב תחתיה בצל עד אשר יראה מה־יהיה בעיר:
6. The response of Jonah to the disaster (1:5c)	**6. The response of the Ninevites to the disaster (3:5)**
ויונה ירד אל־ירכתי הספינה וישכב וירדם:	ויאמינו אנשי נינוה באלהים ויקראו־צום וילבשו שקים מגדולם ועד־קטנם:

7. From among all the sailors the emergence of the unnamed captain of the ship (1:6a) ויקרב אליו רב החבל	**7. From among all the Ninevites the emergence of the unnamed king of Nineveh (3:6a)** ויגע הדבר אל־מלך נינוה
8. The efforts of the captain to avert the disaster (1:6b) ויאמר לו מה־לך נרדם קום קרא אל־אלהיך	**8. The efforts of the king to avert the disaster (3:6-8)** ויקם מכסאו ויעבר אדרתו מעליו ויכס שק וישב על־ האפר: ויזעק ויאמר בנינוה מטעם המלך וגדליו לאמר האדם והבהמה הבקר והצאן אל־יטעמו מאומה אל־ירעו ומים אל־ישתו: ויתכסו שקים האדם והבהמה ויקראו אל־אלהים בחזקה וישבו איש מדרכו הרעה ומן־החמס אשר בכפיהם:
9. The captain expresses hope (1:6c) אולי יתעשת האלהים לנו ולא נאבד:	**9. The king expresses hope (3:9)** מי־יודע ישוב ונחם האלהים ושב מחרון אפו ולא נאבד:

10. The efforts of the sailors to avert the disaster (1:7-16)	10. The efforts of the Ninevites to avert the disaster (3:10)
a. Initiative of the sailors (7-8)	**a. Initiative of the Ninevites**
ויאמרו איש אל־רעהו לכו ונפילה גורלות ונדעה בשלמי הרעה הזאת לנו ויפלו גורלות ויפל הגורל על־יונה: ויאמרו אליו הגידה־נא לנו באשר למי־ הרעה הזאת לנו מה־מלאכתך ומאין תבוא מה ארצך ואי־ מזה עם אתה:	וירא האלהים את־מעשיהם כי־שבו מדרכם הרעה
b. The reply of Jonah (9)	
ויאמר אליהם עברי אנכי ואת־יהוה אלהי השמים אני ירא אשר־עשה את־ הים ואת־היבשה:	
c. Response of the sailors (10-11)	
וייראו האנשים יראה גדולה ויאמרו אליו מה־ זאת עשית כי־ידעו האנשים כי־מלפני יהוה הוא ברח כי הגיד להם: ויאמרו אליו מה־נעשה לך וישתק הים מעלינו כי הים הולך וסער:	

d. Suggestion of Jonah (12)

ויאמר אליהם שאוני והטילני
אל־הים וישתק הים מעליכם
כי יודע אני כי בשלי
הסער הגדול הזה עליכם:

e. Efforts of the sailors (13-15ab)

ויחתרו האנשים להשיב
אל־היבשה ולא יכלו כי
הים הולך וסער עליהם:
ויקראו אל־יהוה ויאמרו
אנה יהוה אל־נא נאבדה
בנפש האיש הזה ואל־תתן
עלינו דם נקיא כי־אתה
יהוה כאשר חפצת עשית:
וישאו את־יונה ויטלהו
אל־הים

f. Result: disaster averted (15c)

ויעמד הים מזעפו:
וייראו האנשים יראה
גדולה את־יהוה ויזבחו־
זבח ליהוה וידרו נדרים:

b. Result: disaster averted (10cd)

וינחם האלהים על־הרעה
אשר־דבר לעשות להם
ולא עשה:

11. Focus returns to Yahweh and Jonah (2:1,2,11)	11. Focus returns to Yahweh and Jonah (4:1-11)
a. What happens to Jonah (1)	a. What happens to Jonah (4:1)
וימן יהוה דג גדול לבלע את־יונה ויהי יונה במעי הדג שלשה ימים ושלשה לילות:	וירע אל־יונה רעה גדולה ויחר לו:
b. Jonah prays (2)	b. Jonah prays (2-3)
ויתפלל יונה אל־יהוה אלהיו ממעי הדגה:	ויתפלל אל־יהוה ויאמר אנה יהוה הלוא־זה דברי עד־היותי על־אדמתי על־כן קדמתי לברח תרשישה כי ידעתי כי אתה אל־חנון ורחום ארך אפים ורב־חסד ונחם על־הרעה: ועתה יהוה קח־נא את־נפשי ממני כי טוב מותי מחיי:
c. Yahweh replies	c. Yahweh replies
(1) by His word (11a)	(1) by His word (4)
ויאמר יהוה לדג	ויאמר יהוה ההיטב חרה לך:

(2) by the use of nature (11b)

a fish

ויקא את־יונה אל־היבשה:

(2) by the use of nature

a plant (6)

וימן יהוה־אלהים קיקיון
ויעל מעל ליונה להיות
צל על־ראשו להציל לו
מרעתו וישמח יונה על־
הקיקיון שמחה גדולה:

a worm (7)

וימן האלהים תולעת
בעלות השחר למחרת ותך
את־הקיקיון וייבש:

wind and sun (8abc)

ויהי כזרח השמש וימן
אלהים רוח קדים חרישית
ותך השמש על־ראש יונה
ויתעלף

d. Jonah responds (8d)

וישאל את־נפשו למות ויאמר
טוב מותי מחיי:

e. God replies (9ab)

ויאמר אלהים אל־יונה ההיטב
חרה־לך על־הקיקיון

f. Jonah replies (9c)

ויאמר היטב חרה־לי עד־מות:

g. Yahweh replies (10-11)

ויאמר יהוה אתה חסת על־
הקיקיון אשר לא־עמלת בו
ולא גדלתו שבן־לילה היה
ובן־לילה אבד: ואני לא
אחוס על־נינוה העיר הגדולה
אשר יש־בה הרבה משתים־עשרה
רבו אדם אשר לא־ידע בין־
ימינו לשמאלו ובהמה רבה:

c. Summary Comments

This chart demonstrates that Jonah is symmetrical in design. There is balance in its over-all structure and length. The motifs of the two sections are parallel. Words, phrases, and even sentences are often repeated verbatim. Certain phenomena which appear in the chart merit special comment:

1) It is not only 3:1 which is patterned after 1:1, but also most of 3:2 repeats 1:2, and the beginnings of 3:3 and 1:3 are the same. This extensive repetition re-enforces strongly the division of the book into two parallel sections. As a didactic device, it instructs the hearer in discerning both the structure of the story and the importance of the opening sentences in each section. This repetition in the design of the book is for the sake of emphasis. By means of it stress is made to fall upon the word of Yahweh and Jonah's response to it.

2) Besides the repetition of entire sentences and paragraphs, various words and phrases are also used in both sections. For example, לברח תרשישה appears in 1:3 and 4:2. The prayer of the sailors (1:14) and the prayer of Jonah (4:2) both contain the phrases אנה יהוה and כי־אתה . The two references to prayers of Jonah (2:2 and 4:2) are introduced identically: ויתפלל " אל־יהוה . The verb 'appoint' is employed repeatedly when Yahweh summons nature for his purposes (2:1; 4:6,7,8).

2) Worthy of special attention is the parallelism between the affirmations of hope uttered by the captain (1:6) and by the king (3:9). The phrases אולי and מי־יודע are both ways of expressing possibility.[1]

---

[1] On the use of אולי to express divine possibility, cf. I Kings

They indicate that the destruction which has been proclaimed absolutely need not inevitably come to pass. The presence of these words sets both affirmations in the same context of "perchance" or "perhaps". Furthermore, in both verses an article is attached to the divine designation: האלהים For the first time in the two Sections of the book this particular form appears.[1] By using the article the narrator makes it quite clear that the captain and the king turn not simply to a divine power but to one particular God. The presence of the article renders a general Semitic appellative into a proper name.[2] In 1:6 האלהים is identified through parallelism with the particular God whom Jonah knows. A similar identification might be argued for this same form in 3:9, even though the equation is not made explicitly in the dialogue attributed to the king. Be that as it may, both captain and king are expressing hope in a particular God. The article may be consciously used here to draw attention to this fact.[3] A further identity between these two verses is the phrase employed to express the outcome: ולא נאבד (see *infra*). In summary, 1:6 and 3:9 are located in corresponding positions in the story; their themes are parallel; and their vocabulary is frequently identical.

18:27; I Sam. 6:5; and Jer. 36:7. On the similar use of מי־יודע cf. II Sam. 12:22; Joel 2:14.

[1] In Section A it occurs nowhere else; in Section B it occurs in the narration which follows the king's wish.

[2] See Chapter II, p. 82f.

[3] These remarks do not mean, however, that *Elohim* (minus the article) is always and inevitably a general Semitic appellative. *Elohim* is used throughout the OT, including *Jonah*, to designate the God of Israel. On the grammatical usage of *Elohim* as a proper name, see G-K 125f; on the theological meaning, see W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT*, I, pp. 184-187.

4) The verb אבד is of additional significance in the total structure and thought of the book. It occurs altogether four times, twice in Section A (1:6,14) and twice in Section B (3:9; 4:10). This verb is always a part of the dialogue of the narrative. It is found once each on the lips of the captain, the sailors, the king, and Yahweh. As we have shown supra, two of the occurrences are precise parallels: 1:6 and 3:9. The remaining two are approximate parallels, located near the end of their respective sections (1:14 and 4:10). The relationships of these four appearances of אבד is thus one of artistic balance. This balance is hardly a matter of coincidence. The crucial position of the verb in the design of the book matches the crucial significance of the verb in the thought of the story. The threat of destruction pervades the prophecy as one central theme. The captain fears that he and his crew will perish via the great storm which the Deity has hurled upon the sea. This fear is the motive behind his command to Jonah to pray for deliverance. The same fear dominates the thinking of the sailors. They do whatever is possible to avoid perishing. Their prayer to Yahweh is first of all a plea that they be not destroyed. In the second half of the book this threat of disaster continues with great force. The one prophetic utterance is none other than a prediction of destruction (3:4). What follows thereafter in Chapter 3 is a response to this pronouncement. Like the sailors, the Ninevites do everything within their power to avert disaster; they do not wish to perish. As Yahweh answered the prayer of the mariners, so he responds to the repentance of the Ninevites. The threatened destruction does not come to pass. In a different vein, Chapter 4 is also concerned with the motif of destruction: Jonah wishes to die. Elsewhere in the tale men have desired not to perish and their desire has been fulfilled; here Jonah

wills to perish and his will is unfulfilled. The working out of this theme of destruction exposes the ambiguous moods of the prophet. At first he is angry unto death because Nineveh has not perished. This anger is abated by the miraculous appearance of the plant. "Jonah rejoiced concerning the qiqayon a great joy" (4:6c). Yet the plant is short-lived. With its disappearance the joy of Jonah disappears and his anger reappears (cf. 4:6c and 4:9). Whereas first Jonah wished to die because Nineveh had not perished, now he wishes to die because the plant has perished. In both instances he is angry at the activity of God. Yahweh uses this incident of the perishing of the plant to instruct the prophet in the folly of his death-wish. Jonah's concern for a worthless plant which perished is contrasted with Yahweh's concern for a great city which did not perish (4:10-11). From beginning to end, then, the theme of destruction is central in the legend. The frequent use and strategic placing of the verb אבד emphasizes this theme in a striking manner.

5) We have examined in detail the many parallels which exist between 1:6 and 3:9. We have further shown that the phrase ולא נאבד, which is common to both these verses, is also paralleled in 1:14. Of the four occurrences of this verb אבד , these three are all in contexts which implore the Deity to withhold destruction. In these contexts a similar terminology is used to introduce the beseeching of the Deity: The captain orders Jonah to "call to your God" (קרא אל-אלהיך , 1:6); the narrator reports that the sailors "called to Yahweh" (ויקראו אל-יהוה , 1:14); and the king exhorts the Ninevites to "call to God" (ויקראו אל-אלהים , 3:8). The repeated use of this phrase, mutatis mutandis, is another mark of literary balance in the book. The similarity in the phrases used to invoke the Deity testifies both to the parallelism in the thoughts being expressed

and to the importance of these expressions. The phrases direct our attention to the motif of absolute dependence upon God. In the face of destruction man has no other alternative but to turn and to repent. The threat of disaster compels the sailors and the Ninevites to call upon God. Thus the repeated occurrences of this phrase, "call upon God", remind us forcefully that the possibility of salvation is His alone.

We have demonstrated in 3, 4, and 5 supra that there are numerous comparisons between vs 8 and 9 of Chapter 3 and vs 6 and 14 of Chapter 1. These comparisons serve two major purposes: a) They enhance the symmetrical design of the book; and b) they direct us to central meanings in the legend. The two purposes are interwined, for it is through analysis of the design of these verses that we are led to their meaning.

6) At two points in the symmetry of Jonah, chiasmus is employed by the narrator. The first chiasmus is constructed in terms of themes. The motif of Section A 5 is related to the motif of Section B 6 as A 6 is related to B 5. In other words, these themes crisscross. The response of the sailors to disaster matches the response of the Ninevites, and the response of Jonah in Section A is parallel to his response in Section B. The second chiasmus is not based upon themes but upon form and length. It concerns 10 and 11 of Sections A and B. Section A 10, which presents the efforts of the sailors to avert disaster, is a long passage of dialogue with connecting statements by the narrator (1:7-16). By contrast, Section B 10 is very brief (3:10); it contains no dialogue but is entirely a narration in the third person. The reverse arrangement exists regarding themes 11 of Sections A and B. A 11 is brief (2:1,2,11) and is a narration with no dialogue; B 11 is long (4:1-11) and consists of a dialogue between Yahweh and Jonah with connecting statements by the narrator. Thus in form

and length A 10 is related to B 11 as A 11 is to B 10. The use of chiasmus lends variety to the scheme of the book.

7) The establishment of the symmetrical design of Jonah supports the tentative judgment which we made concerning 4:5 in our study of the composition of the book.[1] Observing the difficulties presented by this verse in its present location, we concluded that most likely it is misplaced and that originally it followed 3:4. The symmetry of the legend tends to confirm the validity of this judgment. When transposed 4:5 fits appropriately in the structure of the first chiasmus. The response of Jonah to threatened disaster in A 6 is matched by his response in B 5 (i.e., 4:5). Were 4:5 left in its present position, not only would it leave a gap in B 5 but also it would destroy the parallel structure of themes 11c. Hence, in its present position this verse is a misfit which arrests attention because it violates the symmetry of the design. While it would be fallacious to argue for transposition in order to establish symmetry, one can rightly maintain that the symmetry itself argues for transposition. An over-all symmetry is clearly present throughout the book of Jonah. One does not have to "prove" the existence of this symmetry; one has only to point it out. The fact that in its present location 4:5 stands outside this symmetry is not an indictment against the symmetry of Jonah but rather an indictment against the location of 4:5. Thus the regognition of symmetry throws into bold relief both the present misplacement of 4:5 and the original location of it. Having argued for the transposition of 4:5 to follow 3:4 as a matter of composition, we see it substantiated here on the grounds of form criticism.

---

[1] See Chapter II ad loc.

8) Our chart shows parallelism between the themes of the two sections of Jonah but not always correspondence between the length and substance of these themes. The most notable examples of divergences in length and substance include the following: (a) The efforts of the captain to avert disaster (A 8) are told in one brief line (1:6b), while the efforts of the king of Nineveh (B 8) are related in a full paragraph (3:6-8). (b) In A 11b we are told only that Jonah prayed to Yahweh. In B 11b we are given the content of the prayer (4:2). (c) Yahweh's use of nature in B 11c is presented in much greater detail than is his use of the fish in A 11c. His conversation with Jonah at the end of the legend is unmatched in Section A.

These and other similar divergences reveal flaws or defects in the design of the book. The symmetrical scheme is by no means perfect. To acknowledge these imperfections is not, however, to strike a blow against the symmetry of the book. On the contrary, it may be averred that these discrepancies are indigenous to the design itself. Their presence is a part of the symmetry of Jonah; it is not apart from it.

Two different reasons can be adduced for this contention that variations in the length and substance of the parallel themes belong to the balanced scheme of the book. The first reason is common to all forms of Oriental art. It is what George Adam Smith calls "symmetrophobia".[1] Oriental mentality exhibits a marked aversion to absolute schematization. This aversion is expressed in all forms of art. The "flaw" in the pattern of an Oriental rug is a well-known example of it. In literature this phenomenon expresses itself in deviations from the over-all pattern or style of a composition. These deviations range from minor variations to "arbitrary and even violent disturbances"[1] in the design of a unit. They belong to the warp and woof of a given design, and their very presence testifies to the genuineness of that design. This characteristic of "symmetrophobia" is surely one reason for a lack of perfection in the symmetry of _Jonah_; and it is also one sure indication of the validity of that symmetry.

---

[1] George Adam Smith, The Early Poetry of Israel, p. 17f.

A second reason for imperfections in the design of _Jonah_ may be peculiar to this particular story. For didactic purposes the author may have chosen to vary the length and substance of his motifs. The contrast between a theme expressed succinctly and one expounded upon at length may serve to point up what is of great importance. For example, the edict of the king of Nineveh stands out sharply by virtue of the fact that it has no counterpart in the efforts of the captain to avert disaster. By its singleness it draws attention to itself. The precise significance of this edict we shall explore _infra_. Here we only recognize its uniqueness in the symmetry of the book and suggest that this uniqueness, far from spoiling the design of the book, is perhaps a conscious and deliberate effort on the part of the narrator to stress a matter of import.

A similar explanation can be offered for the ending of the book (4:4-11), which, as we have observed, is much more extensive than its parallel motif. One might expect this theme to be expanded precisely because it is the conclusion of the story. Beginnings and endings of biblical narratives are of prime concern.[2] As we have seen, the author stresses the significance of the beginning of this tale by the device of repetition. Nearly all of 1:1-3 is found *verbatim* in 3:1-3. He uses the very opposite device to denote the significance of the ending. Singleness, not repetition, is the distinctive mark of this material. The singleness is brought sharply into focus *contra* its surroundings. The activities of Yahweh in the final scene are unrivalled in any other part of the tale. The account of the plant, the worm, the wind and the sun, as well as of the conversation between Yahweh and Jonah, stands alone and unmatched. Clearly the substance of theme B 11 is *sui generis*. This characteristic is enhanced by the contrast in length between B 11 and the corresponding motif in A 11. By using this device of contrast the author draws our attention to the conclusion of the story. This aberration in the scheme of *Jonah* can be understood as belonging to the didactic aim of the narrator.

---

[1] _Ibid_., p. 17

[2] Cf. the remarks of J. Muilenburg concerning the nature of biblical

What has been proposed here is especially relevant and enlightening for our third example. The content of the prayer of Jonah in 4:2 stands in sharp contrast to the absence of the content of his prayer in 2:2. Three times in the legend prayer is mentioned in connection with Jonah. First, the captain urges Jonah to pray to his god for deliverance from destruction (1:6); whether or not Jonah prays we do not know. On the second occasion, when Jonah is in the belly of the fish, we are told explicitly that he prays but we are not told the content of his prayer.[1] The third occasion for prayer, which is a parallel to the second, is Jonah's rebuke to Yahweh after the salvation of Nineveh. Only in this third case

---

narratives: "Beginning and end are always kept firmly in mind. Everything proceeds from the opening sentence and presses forward in action to the outcome" (*The Way of Israel*, p. 24).

[1] As already discussed, the lack of a specific prayer at this point may have given rise to the insertion of the Psalm.

are we told the substance of his prayer. Ergo this prayer stands alone. Its uniqueness in the external design of the book emphasizes its importance for an understanding of the meaning of the story. We have suggested elsewhere that Jonah is a midrash upon 4:2. This ancient passage is the theological core of our fanciful commentary. What better way to call attention to this lesson than to design the story so that the crucial text has no parallel.

In light of the total symmetry of Jonah, the imperfections in the scheme are seen to have rhyme and reason. No doubt some of them are instances of "symmetrophobia". Others are evidence of the didactic and theological aims of the narrator. The author appears to have disturbed the symmetry deliberately in order to make his listeners aware of the essentials of his message. In a striking manner, then, the external design of Jonah reveals the Tendenz of the legend. Form embodies meaning, and a proper articulation of form yields an understanding of content.

3. Internal Structure

a. Introduction

From a study of the external design of Jonah we proceed to an examination of the internal structure. Our concern here is not primarily with the motifs in the book but rather with the actual forms of the verses; the way in which words, phrases, and clauses are constructed to make sentences and the sentences to make larger sections. We shall endeavor to discern the particular stylistic patterns which the narrator has employed and the possible meanings and/or purposes of these structural features.

At the outset it is important to recognize the presence of different kinds of narrative material in Jonah: narration, dialogue, prayer, prophetic proclamation, and royal decree. The content of a sentence is not unrelated to the structure. To an extent the material dictates the manner in which it is constructed. As the material varies, so likewise may the structure of the material change. Accordingly it would be a mistake to assume that there is one single or consistent structure within Jonah. Each sentence must be examined separately and on its own merits. If on the basis of an analysis of individual sentences we conclude that certain patterns persist in the internal structure of Jonah, then it is a proper methodology which has led us to this conclusion.

b. Section A: Chapters 1 and 2:1,2,11

(1) The Introduction

Unlike many of the prophetic books,[1] Jonah does not begin with a superscription.[2] We are given no information about the date or the location of the prophecy. Instead, the opening statement is an expression which is common in prophetic literature[3] but which nowhere else occurs as the introduction to a book: "And the word of Yahweh came to Jonah, son of Amittai, saying."

Some scholars claim that the first word of this sentence shows that Jonah was once part of a larger whole[4] or that Jonah commences as a narrative similar to Ruth or Esther.[5] Neither claim is warranted for the word

---

[1] E.g., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, Micah.

[2] On the beginnings of the prophetic books, see the unpublished dissertation of Vernon H. Kooy, The Openings of the Former and Latter Prophets, Union Theological Seminary, 1953.

[3] E.g., I Sam. 15:10; II Sam. 7:4; I Kgs. 12:22; 17:2,8; Isaiah 38:4; Jer. 1:4,11; 28:12; Haggai 1:3; 2:20; Zech. 4:8; 7:8. For additional examples, see those cited by Kooy, op. cit., p. 252.

[4] Hengstenberg, op. cit., p. 407; Baudissin, op. cit., p. 592; Pidge, op. cit., p. 13; Hitzig, op. cit., p. 164; Wade, op. cit., p. 120; Lanchester, op. cit., p. 55; Lippl, op. cit., p. 159.

[5] Bewer, op. cit., p. 28; Wade, op. cit., p. 120.

ויהי does not stand independently at the beginning of Jonah. It is only one part of a formula which is frequently employed to introduce revelatory speech. Thus it is a mistake to isolate ויהי from its context. The formula of 1:1 is to be understood as a unit.[1] It is a variation of another well-attested prophetic introduction: דבר־יהוה אשר היה אל־...,.[2] The formula in Jonah is perhaps less formal than is this latter phrase. Accordingly, Kooy suggests that the introduction of Jonah may be a conversational method of prophesying.[3] The suggestion is not without force, particularly when we recall the narrative-form of our legend. By its very character a didactic tale may require a less ceremonial introduction than does an oracle or a discourse.

The absence of detail and color in this stylistic formula serves to focus attention not upon it but upon the dabar to which it points.[4] This "word" is the call of the prophet.

(2) The Call and Response

Yahweh's call of Jonah (1:2) is the first speech in the book. It is presented in a series of three imperatives emphasizing the urgency of the charge:[5] The first imperative stands alone, while to the second a prepositional phrase is attached and to the third a longer clause of indirect discourse is added. The result is a progression in the arrangement and length of the three major sections of the sentence:

---

[1] Myers, op. cit., p. 164.

[2] For a third variation, cf. Zeph. 1:1; Haggai 1:1.

[3] Kooy, op. cit., p. 252.

[4] Weiser, ATD, p. 217.

[5] Cf. the two imperatives in the Call of Amos (7:15). See James H. Kennedy, op. cit., p. 4.

קום

לך to Nineveh the great city

וקרא to her that their evil is come up before me.[1]

The first two imperatives, "arise, go," are characteristic of a Befehlsformel.[2] They are used here, and in other prophetic narratives,[3] as a formula to enumerate a divine commission.

The response of Jonah is told not in words but in action. It begins with the same verb which commenced the Call.[4] The imperative "arise" becomes a declarative: "And Jonah arose...". Immediately, however, a contrast is introduced. The sentence does not continue as a declarative response to the imperative. Instead of the repetition of the second verb of the Call ("go"), a different word is employed: flee. The form of this verb is not a third person imperfect with waw consecutive, as one might expect (cf. 3:2), but an infinitive. By changes in both vocabulary and form continuity is broken between the call and the response. The use of the verb "to flee", with its connotations of willfulness and of haste, stresses forcefully the disobedience of Jonah to the divine command. The prophet does not go to Nineveh; rather he chooses to flee to Tarshish. A further contrast is drawn by the phrases לפני and מלפני . Evil comes

---

[1] With the phrase "their evil is come up before me", cf. similar expressions used in connection with the cities of Sodom (Gen. 18:21) and of Ekron (I Sam. 5:12).

[2] E. Haller, "Die Erzählung von dem Propheten Jona," p. 13.

[3] See especially I Kings 17:8-9a, where the form and sentence structure are identical to Jon. 1:1-2a. See also Jer. 13:4c,6b; cf. Luke 15:18.

[4] For further remarks on this phenomenon, see Jon. 3:1-3 infra.

into the presence of Yahweh, but Jonah flees *from* his presence. These contrasts are further enhanced by the repetition of the key phrases at the conclusion of the verse. N. Lohfink[1] has shown that this verse is constructed on a concentric scheme through the repetition of words and motifs:

Jonah arose to flee *to Tarshish* from the presence of Yahweh.
    and he went down to Joppa
        and he found a ship
            going *to Tarshish*
        and he paid its fare
    and he went down in it
to go with them *to Tarshish* from the presence of Yahweh.

It is readily apparent that the form of this verse is A + B + C + Center + C' + B' + A'. There is balance in its structure, in the length of the corresponding sections, and in the placement of key words and phrases. If the pattern and design of this sentence is valid to the eye, it is even more convincing to the ear.[2] The arrangement of the verse is intended not primarily for a reader but for a hearer.[3] This concentric scheme, in which words and motifs are composed with regularity and rhythm, definitely marks the verse as lyric. The repetitions employed serve several purposes.[4] They are clues to the structure; they bring speaker and hearer into a familiar realm of common words; and they stress the central concern of the author, which is Jonah's disobedience to the prophetic Call. The phrase which stands at the beginning and the end of this verse, "to Tarshish from the presence of Yahweh," reminds us effectively that Jonah is not going to Nineveh according to the word of Yahweh.

---

[1] N. Lohfink, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

[2] See. J. Muilenburg, *The Way of Israel*, p. 18: "The ear can often grasp what the eye cannot; it is the ear, not the eye, that is the important organ in Israel's psychophysical imagery."

[3] N. Lohfink, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

[4] See J. Muilenburg, "A Study in Habfew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," *Congress Volume* I, pp. 97-111, esp. 99ff.

(3) The Voyage at Sea

Having shown the concentric scheme of 1:3, Lohfink continues his form critical analysis by maintaining that the rest of Jonah is constructed in this same manner. At this point, however, his study shifts from an examination of the component parts of actual sentences to a survey of the motifs of a large section (1:4-16). In this section he finds evidence for a concentric scheme similar in arrangement to that of 1:3. But it is most important to recognize that this second concentric scheme is not identical in kind with the first scheme presented. The first scheme is worked out in terms of the structure of words and phrases within one sentence. The second scheme is worked out in terms of themes which persist in a large unit of material. It does not take into account the actual structure of each sentence within the unit. Thus this second scheme is more appropriate to what we have called the External Design of Jonah than it is to the Internal Structure. Be that as it may, we present here Lohfink's development of this concentric circle before we move on to examine the actual sentence structures of this section.

In skeleton outline, the concentric design of 1:4-16 is as follows;[1]

A Framework (1:4-6)
  B Two speeches by the sailors (1:7-8)
    C Confession of Jonah (1:9-10a sic)
  B' Two speeches by the sailors (1:10a -11)
A' Framework (1:12-16)

---

[1] Lohfink, op. cit., p. 201.

Lohfink observes that the beginning and end of this circle share certain parallel motifs:[1]

A	A'
1. beginning of the storm	1. ending of the storm
2. storm hurled to the sea[2]	2. Jonah hurled to the sea
3. sailors crying to God	3. sailors crying to Yahweh
4. sailors in fear	4. sailors in fear of Yahweh

The similarities in the Framework are clearly set forth. Yet these parallels do not encompass the content of the entire Framework. The themes of A appear only in vs 4-5a. In Lohfink's arrangement nothing is said about the content of vs 5b-6. The sleep of Jonah and the words of the captain are unaccounted for. In A' vs 12 and 13 do not figure in the four motifs. Moreover, this very first verse (12) is actually the middle of the dialogue between the sailors and Jonah. In meaning and content it really belongs with the question of v 11. Just as v 9 is Jonah's answer to the mariners' questions in v 8, so v 12 is his answer to their question in v 11. Consequently, to find a break in the structure between vs 11 and 12 appears somewhat arbitrary. One questions why Lohfink makes this division. A possible answer is provided in an examination of the remainder of this concentric scheme. By placing v 12 in the concluding framework, Lohfink is enabled to establish a concentric pattern for B C B'. The confession of Jonah (1:9) stands as the Center of the entire section and is neatly surrounded by two speeches of the sailors, each with two parts. Yet the validity of this arrangement B C B' is certainly challenged by the content and meaning of v 12, which link it with v 11. On these grounds there is some doubt about the legitimacy of Lohfink's scheme. Is he forcing the material into a pattern which is not really present?[1]

---

[1] Idem. Lohfink places special emphasis on the occurrences of the word sea, which is found only in this section of the book.

[2] Cf. also the hurling of wares to the sea.

Even though we find this hypothesis about the concentric arrangement of 1:4-16 not altogether convincing, nevertheless Lohfink has pointed the way to a recognition of numerous structural features in this section. We shall look more closely now at the organization of individual sentences.

It is striking that v 4 does not begin in a characteristic Hebrew style with the verb placed first. Instead the subject of the verb stands first to denote emphasis and contrast. Jonah intends to flee from Yahweh via a sea voyage (3), *but Yahweh* hurls a storm upon the sea (4). This sentence contains three independent clauses, each with a different subject and verb. The first two are linked by the use of the adjective "great" and the noun "sea" in corresponding locations; the third clause has no such verbal connection with the first two:

> But Yahweh hurled a *great* wind to the sea;
> and there was a *great* tempest in the sea;
> and the ship thought to break.

The content of the second and third clauses is the result of Yahweh's action in the first. This result is described as it affects the sea, then as it affects the ship, and, in the succeeding verse (5), as it affects the inhabitants of the ship. There is a movement in this description from the general to the specific.

In addition to this link in the contents of vs 4 and 5, two key expressions in v 4 ("hurled"; "to the sea") are also carried forward into v 5.

---

[1] Cf. our remarks *supra* on the danger of trying to impose one structural pattern upon the book.

This latter sentence consists of six clauses, three of which pertain to the sailors and the other three to Jonah. Once again the narrator utilizes the stylistic device of contrast by beginning the second major division of the sentence with the noun ויונה . As with ויהוה of v 4, the usual order of the Hebrew is deliberately reversed to stress the striking difference between the response of the sailors and the response of Jonah to the storm:

> And the sailors were afraid,
> and they cried, each man to his god,
> and they hurled the wares which were in the ship
> to the sea to lighten . . . from upon them.[1]
>
> BUT Jonah went down to the inner recesses of the ship,
> and he lay down,
> and he went to sleep.

This arrangement shows a certain symmetry in the use of verbs: three verbs with sailors as their subject and three others with Jonah as their subject.

Verse 6 introduces us to a section of dialogue which continues through v 13. This dialogue is interspersed with narration. The narration serves to introduce the dialogue (e.g., 1:6a, 7a, 8a, 9a, 10b, 11a, 12a), to stress important themes (e.g., 1:10a, c; 11c; 13c), and to supply information essential to the development of the story (e.g., 1:7c,d; 13). Whereas not every sentence in this section is of distinctive structural significance, a number are worthy of special comment.

---

[1] In the Hebrew text no object is expressed after the infinitive "to lighten". Translations usually supply the pronoun "it". Many commentators interpret "it" as referring to the ship. The sailors struggle to lighten the ship in order to make it easier to manage and to protect it in the storm (see, inter alia, Bewer, op. cit., p. 32; Smart, op. cit., p. 881;

The words of the captain to Jonah are presented in a series of three succinct clauses whose emphases are tersely set forth:

מה to you, sleeping!

Arise, call to your God.

אולי God will think of us and we will not perish.

As in Yahweh's command in 1:1, there is a progression in the length of these three clauses. Hebrew particles introduce the first and third statements. Each of them expresses in its own peculiar way the mood of the speech which it commences.[1] The surprise and shock of the captain in finding Jonah asleep is contained in the interjection מה , the very sound of which may summon the attention of the hearer to the seriousness of the situation. The use of אולי marks a mood of wistfulness and of hope. Between the exclamation and the hope lies the command. Its sharpness is accentuated by two imperatives standing side by side without a conjunction

---

Myers, op. cit., p. 165). A second interpretation is also possible: the "it" may refer to the sea. It is to be noted that "sea" is the noun immediately preceding "to lighten". Moreover, the sea was a great threat to ancient peoples. As for the Hebrews in particular, their small knowledge of it intensified their fears of it (see Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos; Noth, The History of Israel, p. 13; Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 391; P. Reymond, L'Eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l'A.T.). Accordingly it can be maintained that the sailors hurl their wares to the sea in order to appease it. The wares are a sacrifice to calm the anger of the storm. This idea is expressed explicitly when the sailors later hurl Jonah to the sea (1:12,15). The incident tends to confirm our suggested interpretation of the object implied in 1:5. It is the sea which the mariners struggle to lighten from upon them.

For this interpretation the writer is indebted to Dr. George M. Landes of Union Theological Seminary (oral communication).

[1] On the uses and meanings of Hebrew particles, see J. Muilenburg, "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כי in the Old Testament," HUCA 32 (1961), 135f.

between them.[1]

The stylistic use of particles in conveying meaning is demonstrated even more effectively by the questions which the mariners ask Jonah (1:8). These questions are extremely brief and terse. Each one is introduced by the particle מה or מ , suggesting a kind of alliteration which impresses itself upon the hearer. By means of this structure the dialogue is easily grasped and remembered:

> And they said to him,
> Tell us, we beseech you,
> באשר למי־ this evil is upon us?
> מה is your occupation?
> ומאין have you come?
> מה is your land?
> ואי־מזה people are you?

The piling up of questions here, one upon another, creates a mood of excitement and of pressure.[2] The frequent use of the particles contributes to the rapidity of the speech.[3] Thereby a sense of urgency and of anxiety is conveyed to the hearer.

Verses 10-13 are of special interest because these four sentences are structured similarly and because they exhibit a number of literary characteristics which are distinctively Hebraic:

---

[1] Cf. the two imperatives in 1:2.

[2] See Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[3] Cf. Muilenburg, "...Usages of the Particle ...", p. 135: Hebrew particles "are by no means static linguistic entities, morphemes to be scrutinized independently of their contexts, but are rather agents of movement."

[10]And the sailors were afraid a great fear,
and they said to him:
מה is this you have done!
כי the sailors knew that from the presence of Yahweh
he was fleeing.

[11]And they said to him:
מה ought we to do to you that the sea may be quiet
from upon us?
כי the sea was getting rougher and rougher.

[12]And he said to them:
Pick me up and hurl me to the sea that the sea
may be quiet from upon you.
כי I know that on account of me this great tempest
is upon you.

[13]And the sailors "digged" to return to the dry land,
and they were not able
כי the sea was getting rougher and rougher.

In these four verses the following features are noteworthy:

1) The framework of this unit consists of two statements about the sailors: they were afraid (10a), and they "digged"...(13a). Set within this framework is the body of the unit; it consists of three dialogic encounters between the sailors and Jonah.

2) Each dialogic section is constructed in three parts: introduction, speech, and conclusion.

3) The same stylistic formula introduces each of the speeches: "And

they (he) said to him (them)."

4) The first speech is an exclamation; the second an interrogation; and the third an imperative.

5) The middle speech is related to both the first and the third through repetition of themes and words. It begins with the particle מה , as does the first speech. The sailors exclaim, "What is this you have done!" and then they ask, "What shall we do to you?" The second half of their question - "that the sea may be quiet from upon us" - is repeated in the second half of the subsequent reply of Jonah. He urges the mariners to throw him overboard "that the sea may be quiet from upon you". Clearly in both words and thought the three speeches are linked together. Their connection is evident in the artistic arrangement of the sentences.

6) The conclusion of each of the four verses is introduced by the all-significant particle כי . This particle is used most frequently in the OT as a word of motivation.[1] So it functions in these verses, as it gives the reasons for the statements which precede it: a) The mariners utter words of astonishment *because* they know that Jonah is fleeing from Yahweh. b) The sailors inquire what to do with the guilty prophet *because* the sea continues to rage even more furiously against them. c) Jonah urges that he be hurled into the sea *because* he is the cause of the storm. d) Instead of following Jonah's order, the mariners struggle to reach dry land. They have no success *because* the sea rages furiously. In all these verses our narrator consistently and regularly supplies us with the motivation for speeches and statements. Each time the particle כי serves as the agent through which this motivation is conveyed.

---

[1] See J. Muilenburg, "...the Particle כי ", *op. cit.*, pp. 136-160 and esp. p. 150.

7) In two additional places the particle כי is of great import: vs 10 and 12 where it is used with the verb 'to know' (ידע). The phrase "for...know that" is an emphatic expression which gives force to the content of the indirect discourse which follows it.[1] This usage is clearly apparent in v 10 where the indirect discourse is the important declaration that Jonah is fleeing from Yahweh. In v 12 the phrase has a similar emphasis; it introduces Jonah's *confession* that he is the culprit who has caused the storm.[2] The mariners *know* *that* Jonah is fleeing from Yahweh. Jonah *knows* *that* he is responsible for their trouble. The phrase "know that" is used to draw our attention to the importance of what is being disclosed.

8) The conclusions of vs 10 and 12 are parallel in part; the conclusions of vs 11 and 13 are identical. The repetition of the phrase, "for the sea was getting rougher and rougher," brings to an end this unit of narration and dialogue.

A different kind of material appears in v 14: the prayer of the mariners to Yahweh. In setting, content, and form this prayer belongs to the *Gattung* of the Lament (*Klagelieder*).

The *Sitz* *im* *Leben* of a Lament is an occasion of dire misfortune which has come upon an individual or a group.[3] Addressed to God, the Lament may come either from the innocent who protests his misery or from the penitent who knows full well the cause of his distress. The content of Laments consists in some or all of the following elements: petitions, descriptions of distress, complaints, confessions, reasonings, expressions of confidence in God, the making of vows, the offering of sacrifices, and the rendering of thanks for deliverance.[1]

---

[1] This phrase,often introduced by עתה instead of כי, occurs repeatedly in the OT as an introduction to crucial texts: e.g., Gen. 22:12; Ex. 18:11; Jos. 2:0; Judg. 17:33; II Kgs. 5:15; 17:24; Jer. 29:11; Ps. 20:7; 135:5. See also J. Muilenburg, "...Particle כי," p. 138, n.11.

[2] Cf. the same phrase in 4:2 and see our comments *ad* *loc*.

[3] For a more extensive treatment of this *Sitz* *im* *Leben*, see our discussion on Jonah 3:5-10 *infra*.

In *Jonah* a great storm threatens to destroy the ship and its passengers. First, the sailors resort simultaneously to prayer (5b); secondly, they resort to human means of saving themselves by hurling their wares into the sea (5c);[2] thirdly, they *demand* that God himself reveal through lots the cause of their trouble (7).[3] When the lot falls on Jonah, the sailors are reluctant to dispose of the guilty one. Once again they endeavor unsuccessfully to save themselves by returning the ship to dry land (13). Now out of utter desperation they call upon Yahweh (14). They are innocent creatures who are threatened with destruction because of the disobedience of another. Out of this situation of calamity comes their dirge:

And they called to Yahweh and they said:

Introduction: אנה Yahweh

Body: אל־נא let us perish for the life of this man;

ואל place upon us innocent blood.

Conclusion: כי You Yahweh

כאשר you wished you did.

---

[1] On the *Klagelieder*, see Gunkel, "Psalmen," RGG$_1$, col. 1934f; *ibid*., "Psalmen," RGG$_2$, col. 1614f, 1617f; *ibid*., *Einleitung in die Psalmen*, pp. 117-139; 172-265; A. R. Johnson, "The Psalms," OTMS, p. 166f; Weiser, *The OT*, pp. 34-37; Bentzen, *op. cit*., I, pp. 154-159.

[2] As we have noted, this effort may have been an act of sacrifice.

[3] Delcor, *op. cit*., p. 279, points out this progression in the story.

An analysis of the content and form of this dirge is illuminating. The Introduction is an invocation. The Body is a petition in which the innocent protest their misfortune and plead for acquittal; the Conclusion contains their reasoning, or motivation, as well as an expression of confidence in God. Each section of the Lament commences with a particle. Appropriately a strong word of entreaty stands first.[1] One component of this word is joined with an adverb of negation to introduce the petition. The force of the negative is strengthened by the presence of נא .[2] By virtue of its position the particle נא governs the entire petition, even though it is not expressed explicitly in the second part.[3] Whereas the particles which stand first in the Introduction and Body of this Lament are practically identical, that particle commencing the Conclusion is altogether different. As we have seen, כי is in itself a most important word. Here again it functions as a term of motivation. It is followed not by a verb but by the divine name. This location of the Tetragrammaton serves for emphasis. The emphasis is intensified by the use of the pronoun You. Just as Yahweh is invoked in the Introduction, so He is called upon in the Conclusion. The Tetragrammaton occurs at approximately the same place in both sections. Within the כי clause of the Conclusion the word כאשר functions as a subordinate particle. It leads us to the verbs of the Conclusion חפצת עשית . The use of the qal perfect may be understood as referring to an action completed in the past. In this case, the mariners are reminding

---

[1] Actually a combination of two particles: אה, נא ; see BDB, p. 58.

[2] BDB, p. 39; G-K 105b; 108b,c.

[3] On the construction ואל־תתן , see G-K 109c.

Yahweh that He Himself has already condemned Jonah through the medium of lots.[1] Their statement may also be interpreted in reference to their present plan to throw Jonah overboard. What they now plan to do is what Yahweh would have them do.[2] Therefore they are not to be held accountable for the death of the prophet. They are fulfilling the will of God, and God's will must be done.

This prayer brings to a close the dialogue in Section A of the legend. The remaining verses are all narration. Two of them reveal the same threefold pattern of sentence structure which we have observed elsewhere:

[15]Then they picked Jonah up,
and they hurled him to the sea,
and the sea ceased from its raging.
[16]And the men were afraid a great fear of Yahweh,
and they vowed vows to Yahweh,
and they sacrificed sacrifices.

(4) The Episode of the Fish

Only this episode in Section A (2:1,2,11) remains to be examined in terms of structure. Lohfink observes that its scheme is chiastic and gives its pattern as A + B + B' + A'.[3]

---

[1] Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

[2] Dale, *op. cit.*, *Expositor*, p. 8; T. H. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 121f. Robinson suggests that the plea, "Do not place upon us innocent blood," may be reminiscent of the formula used in executions: "His blood come upon his own head." Cf. II Sam. 1:16; I Kgs. 2:32,33,37. On *dam* as parallel to *hephesh*, see A. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual*, p. 71ff.

[3] Lohfink, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

And Yahweh appointed a great fish to swallow Jonah,
•••••• '''' *****

and Jonah was *in the belly of the fish* three days and three nights.
*****

And Jonah prayed to Yahweh his god *from the belly of the fish*,
*****

And Yahweh spoke to the fish and it vomited Jonah on the dry land.
•••••• '''' *****

c. Section B: Chapters 3 and 4

(1) Introduction, Call, Response

As we have already demonstrated, the opening verses of Chapter 3 parallel 1:1-3. This Introduction (3:1) repeats *verbatim* the prophetic formula of 1:1. Yahweh's Call of Jonah (3:2) is presented here with the same three imperatives and with the same progressive sentence structure as it is in 1:2. Only the objective clause of the last verb differs in wording:

קום
לך to Nineveh the great city
וקרא to her the message which I am speaking to you.

The response of Jonah to this Call is obedience. This obedience is witnessed to in the vocabulary and structure of 3:3:

And Jonah arose,
and he went to Nineveh according to the word of God.
Now Nineveh was a city great to God of three days' journey.

In this response the first two imperatives of the Call become indicatives. The third imperative likewise becomes an indicative in 3:4, which is a continuation of the account of Jonah's response. Yahweh orders, "Arise, go, and call." In turn Jonah arises, he goes, and he calls. Unlike the negative response in 1:3, which is expressed through changes in vocabulary and form, this response in 3:3 preserves a continuity with the Call in vocabulary and form.

From a stylistic viewpoint it is interesting that the narrator does not simply report that Jonah obeys. He gives us this information by repeating in detail portions of the Call. This repetition of a command in declarative form to show that it is being executed is a characteristic of Semitic literary style. In the OT this phenomenon appears frequently, e.g., in the Elijah stories (I Kgs. 17:2-5,8; 18:2,41,43; 19:7). Yahweh's imperatives to Elijah are repeated in full in the declaratives which report the prophet's response (see also Jer. 13:1ff). In extra-biblical literature an extreme example of this phenomenon occurs in the Legend of King Keret.[1] The deity El issues a lengthy series of commands to Keret (line 60ff). Instead of succinctly reporting that Keret carries out these commands, the author of the Legend repeats in declarative form the entire series of commands (line 156ff). Jonah 3:1-4b reflects this same style and form.

The only prophetic utterance by Jonah are the five words of doom in 3:4: "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be destroyed." This message is short and simple. It has no classical introduction, such as "Thus says the Lord"; it is not concluded by a stylistic formula, such as "Oracle of Yahweh". In other words, this utterance does not partake of the elements of a standard prophetic Botenspruch.[2] Perhaps these elements are missing because of the context in which the proclamation appears: a formal or standard Botenspruch would hardly be appropriate in an informal story.[1] In one sense it may be a mistake to single out these five words as a prophetic utterance. The entire legend is a prophetic message, and it is introduced (1:1 and 3:1) by a standard formula.[2] The prediction of doom is actually only a small portion of this entire message; it does not stand alone. As part of a prophecy, it does not require its own introduction and conclusion.

---

[1] H. L. Ginsberg, "The Legend of King Keret," pp. 14-32.

[2] On the Botenspruch, see James F. Ross, "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, pp. 98-107, esp. pp. 99-101, and bibliography cited there. See also Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, p. 45f, 55ff; Westermann, op. cit., p. 70ff; see now R. Rendtorff, "Botenformel und Botenspruch," ZAW 74 (1962), 165-177.

(2) Life in Nineveh

Jonah 3:5-10 is concerned with responses to the threat of destruction pronounced in 3:4. This section contains our only first-hand picture of Nineveh. Elsewhere the city is talked about; it is an object of sympathetic concern for Yahweh and an object of distress for Jonah. In this section, however, the writer permits the city to speak for itself. Nineveh is portrayed in action.

In a situation of pronounced doom the Ninevites act to avert misfortune. They fast, they clothe themselves in sackcloth, they sit in ashes, they confess their evil, and they call upon God to save them. As a result of their sincere repentance, God himself repents of the predicted destruction, and Nineveh is saved.

This episode contains three elements: a) a threat of disaster to an entire society; b) acts of penitence by the whole society in order to avert disaster; c) the outcome, in which God acts to save. These elements are not unique to the book of Jonah. The same three-fold pattern persists in similar scenes throughout the OT. Of the numerous parallels which might be cited,[1] the following are representative:

---

[1] But see I Kgs. 17:14 where a standard introduction does precede a prophetic utterance in the informal context of a narrative.

[2] See esp. Rendtorff, op. cit., pp. 172-175.

I Samuel 7:3-14: a) The Philistines threaten to destroy Israel in battle. Samuel makes it clear that this threat stems from the sin of Israel in not serving Yahweh (3). Only repentance can move Yahweh to avert the disaster. b) Accordingly, all Israel gathers at Mizpah to fast (6), to cry to Yahweh for help (8), and to offer burnt offerings (9). c) After these acts of penitence, Yahweh "thunders with a mighty voice against the Philistines" (10). The disaster is averted. Yahweh has saved his people.

Parallels to Jonah are apparent in this episode. The major themes are identical. Variations exist only in the external developments: e.g., the disaster which threatens Israel comes through a foreign nation, whereas Nineveh's disaster comes directly from Yahweh. In both cases, however, the cause of the calamity is the sin of the people. Perhaps a parallel also exists between Samuel and the king of Nineveh. They are the only individuals who appear in the respective accounts; they both act in official capacities with specific instructions for their peoples. The story in *Samuel* is clearly placed in a cultic setting at Mizpah. Such a setting is not explicitly given in *Jonah*, but it may be suggested by the very nature of the activities described.

II Samuel 24:[2] a) The threatened destruction is in the form of pestilence (13ff). The cause is sin against Yahweh, which has been committed in David's taking a census. The disaster threatens all Israel and Judah "from

---

[1] See Johnson, "Psalms", *OTMS*, p. 167, esp. n.2

[2] For a discussion of the critical problems in this chapter, see Pfeiffer, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 367.

Dan to Beersheba" (1,15). b) David acts to prevent the pestilence by confession (10), by calling upon God's mercy (14), and by sacrificing burnt offerings (24). c) The outcome is salvation(25b).

Of special interest in this account is the mention of the city Jerusalem which Yahweh's angel is about to destroy. The destruction does *not* come because "Yahweh repents of the evil" (16). This identical thought, with an almost identical vocabulary,[1] is found in Jon. 3:10. Just as Yahweh repents of the evil intended for Jerusalem, so God repents of the evil intended for Nineveh.

Jeremiah 36: This situation is expressed in terms of hope. That all of it does not actually take place affects not at all our point that the passage is another illustration of the three-fold pattern of threat, penitence, and salvation.

a) A threat of destruction by Yahweh is made known to "all the people" in a Temple Sermon. b) The people themselves proclaim a fast (9). Yahweh hopes that upon hearing his threat, they will make supplication to him and turn from their evil (7). c) If they do, then salvation is sure. Yahweh will forgive their sin (3).

The language in one part of this chapter links it closely with the book of *Jonah*. An element of hope pervades both accounts. The king of Nineveh hopes that God will repent (מי־יודע); Yahweh hopes that Judah will repent (אולי ; cf. Jon. 1:9). Both passages speak of "the evil" (הרעה) which the Deity plans "to do to them"(לעשות להם); cf. Jer. 36:3 with Jon. 3:10. Both passages use the very same vocabulary in describing men who "turn from their way of evil".[1]

---

[1] Cf. וינחם יהוה אל־הרעה (II Sam. 24:16 with וינחם האלהים על־הרעה (Jon. 3:10).

Ezra 8:21-23: a) Ezra and those returning with him to Jerusalem are threatened by possible enemy attacks along the way. b) To prevent such an attack Ezra proclaims a fast and implores *all* the people to seek help from God (21). Involved in these acts of penitence are not only the adults but also "our children and all our goods". c) The entreaties are heard, and God saves the people (23).

The stress here on the entire community participating in acts of penitence recalls that same emphasis in *Jonah*. Within the group Ezra alone stands out as an individual, just as the king of Nineveh is the only individual mentioned in *Jonah*.

Esther 3:7-4:17: a) The threat of destruction is levelled at all Jews through the edict of King Ahasuerus. b) They try to prevent the annihilation by acts of penitence, including mourning, rending of clothes, and lying in sackcloth and ashes (vs 1,3,15). c) The outcome is salvation for the Jews.

The closest analogy to *Jonah* in this passage is the list of the acts of penitence, particularly the use of sackcloth and ashes. It may also be pointed out that Mordecai is the single individual engaged in this penitence; the others are simply referred to as "all the Jews".

Our final example of this three-fold pattern of threat, penitence, and salvation comes from the Apocrypha: *Judith 4:9-15.* Like *Jonah*, this story is a popular Hebrew tale. a) The threat of destruction comes to Israel from Holofernes, the chief captain of the army of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria! b) To avert this disaster, all Israel proceeds to call upon God (4:9). "They, and their wives, and their babes, and their cattle, and every sojourner and hireling and servant bought with their money, put sackcloth upon their loins" (10). They also "cast ashes upon their heads" (11), and they beseech Yahweh in his Temple at Jerusalem. c) The result is that Yahweh hears their cry (13) and eventually, through the woman Judith, he prevents the disaster.

---

[1] Jer. 36:3 -) - ישובו איש מדרכו הרעה
Jon. 3:8 -) וישובו
Cf. also Jon. 3:10.

This situation is a close parallel to Jonah in several respects. The acts of penitence are similar. The reference to cattle participating in the mourning rites is especially noteworthy (cf. Jon. 3:7-8).

The six passages reviewed above show that Jonah 3:5-10 records not an isolated event but a situation well known to the Hebrews.[1] All these passages reveal the three-fold theme of threatened disaster, acts of penitence, and resultant salvation. The form of the disaster may vary; the cause of it is most often the sin of the people. In each case the alternative to destruction is repentance. Furthermore, the repentance must be undertaken by all the people; in some instances their goods and their cattle are explicitly included. The emphasis is upon the entire society, not upon one segment of it. To stress that total repentance is required a passage may sometimes enumerate the people involved.[2] Quite often the society is guided in acts of penitence by an individual leader, be he a prophet (Samuel, Jeremiah), a priest (Ezra), an outstanding citizen (Mordecai), or a king (David and the king of Nineveh). In each of our accounts only this one individual emerges from the society; other participants are not singled out. Often a cultic context is supplied for these acts of penitence. Israel gathers around Samuel at Mizpah; Jeremiah's sermon is delivered in the Temple; Ezra as a priest assembles the people for worship; in *Judith* the Temple is the setting for the rites.[1] On the basis of this evidence, it is possible that the episode in *Jonah* reflects a cultic experience. In other words, the fashioner of the legend makes use of an actual cultic event in this section of his story. The description of Nineveh's response to disaster is not a mere folkloristic invention. The narrator draws upon a situation well known in the cultic life of ancient Israel.[2]

---

[1] See Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, pp. 458-461.

[2] E.g., II Chron. 20:13.

As we observed in our remarks about the prayer of the mariners in 1:14, it is precisely this *Sitz im Leben* which gives rise to Communal Laments. In 3:7-9 the edict of the king is in part a summons to lament. It charges the Ninevites to *invoke* and to *petition* God. The king expresses *confidence* that God may save the city; this hope in God's grace is named as the *motive* or *reason* for penance.[3] His proclamation, then, contains some raw materials out of which a *Klagelieder des Volkes* might be fashioned.

The author has skillfully and artistically arranged this entire section. His structure corresponds to his content and makes clear his major emphases, as the following outline demonstrates:

---

[1] Cf. also I Kgs. 8:33-36,44ff.

[2] There is evidence in these passages for the existence of a *terminus technicus* for this *Sitz im Leben*. While the point may not be pushed too far, it may be significant that phrases such as "Yahweh repents of evil" and "men turn from their way of evil" occur in more than one passage. Likewise the expression of hope in such terms as אולי and מי־יודע indicates a common terminology.

[3] Weiser suggests that the phrase, "who knows God may turn and repent...," is taken over from the liturgy of penance; cf. Joel 2:14 (*ATD*, p. 223).

Structure of Jonah 3:5-10:

The Response to Threatened Disaster

A. The Popular Response (3:5)

Now the people of Nineveh believed in God,

and they proclaimed a fast,

and they clothed themselves in sackcloth,
from the oldest to the youngest.

B. The Royal Response (3:6-9)

"And the word reached the king of Nineveh."

1. The king acts as individual:

"And he arose from his throne,
and he removed his robe
and he clothed himself in sackcloth,
and he sat upon ashes."

2. The king acts as ruler:

The Royal Edict

Introduction:	And he cried and said:
Authorization:	In Nineveh From the decree of the king and his nobles
Salutation:	Men and beasts Cattle and sheep
Corpus:	
Negative instructions:	Let them not taste anything; Let them not feed; Let them not drink water
Positive instructions:	Let them clothe themselves in sackcloth; [Man and beast] Let them call to God with strength; Let them turn, each man, from his way of evil from the violence which is in his hands

Conclusion:	Who knows,
Divine	God may return and he may repent and he may turn from the anger of his nostril.
Human	And we will not perish.

C. The Divine Response (3:10)

And God saw their deeds,
  that they turned from their way of evil;

and God repented of the evil which he said to do to them,

and he did not do it.

This section opens and closes with sentences of three clauses each. The popular response to disaster corresponds in structure to the divine response. Between these two is the royal response. As our outline shows, the Edict is carefully and properly constructed, with an official "seal" of authorization and a salutation.[1] The body of the Edict contains a series of three negative and three positive jussives.[2] These are followed by a set of three indicatives. There is a rhythm and a pattern in the organization of the royal decree, based on these three sentences of three clauses each. To be sure, however, this pattern is not stereotyped and rigid. Deviations from it are present also.

Repetition of themes and phrases is another characteristic of this structure. For instance, the people of Nineveh clothe themselves in sackcloth, the king clothes himself in sackcloth, and the citizens are then officially ordered to clothe themselves in sackcloth. The stress on this act points up the importance of penitence in the story. Likewise, the frequent appearance of the verb שוב (or נחם) emphasizes the seriousness of repentance and the hope of salvation which may come through repentance. The Ninevites are urged to turn from their way of evil, with the possibility that God may then turn from visiting evil upon them. The phrase, "turn from the violence which is in his hands," finds a parallel in God's turning "from the anger of his nostril". The phrase "way of evil" is used repeatedly (3:8,10). There is also a great stress upon *deeds* in this section. Throughout the verbs display action. Again and again they tell us what the Ninevites are *doing* to avoid disaster. Then, in the final and climatic verse, God sees their *deeds* (מעשיהם); he repents of what he threatened to *do* (לעשות)to them; and he does not *do* (עשה) it.

---

[1] P. J. B. Schaumberger maintains that this Edict may be based on genuine Assyrian records. See "Das Bussedikt des Konigs von Ninive bei Jonas 3, 7.8 in keilschriftlicher Beleuchtung," Miscellanea Biblica II, pp. 123-134. His evidence, however, can hardly be used to substantiate the historicity of the narrative; see A. Feuillet, "Les Sources du livre de Jonas," RB 54 (1947), 161ff.

[2] This heaping up of commands is reminiscent of the piling up of questions in Chapter 1.

(3) A Closing Dialogue

The theme of evil (רעה), which figured prominently in the preceding section, continues in this final episode. Whereas before this word was attached to the Ninevites (3:8,10) and to God (3:10), here it assumes a third variation in reference to Jonah. The Ninevites turn from their *evil*; Yahweh repents of his *evil*. Consequently, Jonah is full of *evil*. When Nineveh and God turn from evil, then he turns to evil: "And it was evil to Jonah a great evil, and it burned to him" (4:1).

In his anger Jonah prays to Yahweh (4:2-3). The structure of his prayer is similar to the outline of the Lament of the sailors in 1:14:[1]

---

[1] A comparison of these two prayers is instructive. Both are occasioned

And he prayed to Yahweh and he said:

Introduction: אנה Yahweh

Body:

Complaint הלוא־ this my word while I was
still in my country?

על־כן I hastened to flee to Tarshish.

Motivation כי ידעתי כי אתה God (are)

gracious and merciful
slow to anger
and abundant in love
and repentant of evil

Conclusion: ועתה Yahweh

Petition קח־נא my life from me

Motivation כי better my death than my life.

Particles play a prominent role in this structure in introducing the chief divisions of the prayer. We have already discussed the significance of the terms אנה , נא , and כי . The phrase על־כן is also important. It serves a double function in indicating that the sentence which it begins is both linked to the preceding sentence and at the same time is

---

by a "calamity" for their respective supplicants: the threat of the storm for the sailors and the sparing of Nineveh for Jonah. The prayers have similar narrative prefaces. They commence with the same invocation. The Tetragrammaton occurs in similar places throughout. Both prayers are structured on particles. Their content is parallel: 1:14 - invocation, ---------, petition, motivation; 4:2 - invocation, complaint, petition, motivation. The subject of the petitions is the same: the *nephesh* of Jonah. The attitudes expressed towards this subject are opposite. The sailors ask that Jonah's *nephesh* not cause their destruction; Jonah asks that his *nephesh* be destroyed. The sailors find life more desirable than death; Jonah finds death the more attractive. Another parallel in the content of these two prayers concerns the nature and activity of God. The motivation for both petitions is the acknowledgment that Yahweh is in control to manifest his will. The sailors simply affirm that Yahweh has done according as it pleased him. Jonah's lengthy confession is a description of the nature of Yahweh, which, as we have said, is the heart of the legend.

complete in itself.[1] In our prayer the phrase introduces a sentence explaining Jonah's flight to Tarshish. It is preceded by a rhetorical question in which the prophet suggests the justification for his flight.

The heart of Jonah's prayer is the motivation clause introduced by the emphatic proclamation כי ידעתי כי . Dr. James Muilenburg has suggested[2] that the verb ידע , in a context such as this one, may perhaps be rendered confess rather than know. This suggestion is supported by our contention that the content of this clause is the central affirmation of Jonah. We have held that the entire legend is a commentary (midrash) upon this verse. We have further observed the distinctiveness of this prayer in the External Design of the book.

J. Scharbert has contributed significantly to an understanding of this confession in a form-critical study of Exodus 34:6f and its parallels.[3] Scharbert interprets the passage in Exodus as a liturgical appeal to Yahweh rather than as a first-person revelation of the Deity.[4] He isolates nine components in this prayer, many of which have their own sub-divisions. From a study of all the parallels and allusions to this complete scheme, Scharbert discerns several cultic formulae of confession throughout the OT. Jon. 4:2 is one representative of the first formula he designates:[5]

יהוה אל רחום וחנון ארך אפים ורב חסד (ואמת)

---

[1] Pedersen, op. cit., I-II, p. 117f.

[2] Oral communication.

[3] Josef Scharbert, "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f und seiner Parallelen," Biblica 38 (1957), 130-150.

[4] It is difficult to determine the subject of the verb קרא in Ex. 34:5,6. Cf. Noth, Exodus, p. 261.

[5] Other statements of this formula are in Ex. 34:6; Joel 2:13; Neh. 9:17; Ps. 86:15; 103:8; 145:8. Parts of the formula are to be found in Num. 14:18; Ps. 111:4; II Chron. 30:9; Nah. 1:2f.

Jonah, along with Joel 2:13, includes in its version of this formula one additional phrase: ונחם על־הרעה . Scharbert calls this formula a *Gebetsruf* and finds its origin (*Sitz im Leben*) in a cultic context. Its component parts can be sketched thus:

1)	יהוה		
2)	אל		
3b)	חנון	a)	ורחום
4a)	ארך אפים	b)	ורב־חסד
c)	————	d)	ונחם על־הרעה

Verses 4, 6-11 fall into a scheme of questions and answers. Yahweh replies to Jonah's prayer of confession by singling out for consideration the mood of anger in which the prayer was expressed. It is not the prayer itself which needs elucidation or justification; it is the anger of Jonah which needs to be understood. Towards this end Yahweh acts to show Jonah that his anger is not beneficial. The prophet replies by clinging fast to his anger:

Question: Is anger good to you?

Yahweh's Answer:

A. 1. And Yahweh-Elohim appointed a plant.

2. And it grew up upon Jonah to be a shade upon his head to deliver him from his evil.

3. And Jonah rejoiced concerning the plant a great joy.

B. 1. And Yahweh appointed a worm when the dawn came up the next day.

2. And it smote the plant and it withered.

C. 1. And it came to pass when the sun arose that God appointed a .... east wind.

2. And the sun beat upon the head of Jonah.

3. And he fainted and he asked his nephesh to die.

Jonah's Answer:

Better my death than my life.

Question: Is anger good to you concerning the plant?

Answer: Anger is good to me even unto death.

Repetition of words and phrases is one device which ties this section together. Yahweh's two questions are the same. His own answer to the first question is set forth in three phases, each introduced by the verb מנה . The first and third of these three phases are sentences of three clauses each. These clauses are concerned with 1) an action by Yahweh, 2) the purpose of that action, and 3) the result of that action for Jonah. The second sentence in this triad consists of only 1) the statement and 2) its purpose. Just as Yahweh's questions are identical, so Jonah's answers are the same. The prophet persists in wishing for death. It is a wish first expressed verbally in the conclusion of his prayer (4:3). The theme and the words are reiterated here several times (4:8de, 9c).

Jonah's last statement of defiance gives way to the final verse of the legend - another question by Yahweh. Its meaning we shall consider at a later point. Suffice it here to observe the structure of the question:

אתה had pity concerning the plant
אשר you did not plant and did not make grow,
(א)ש(ר) was a son of the night and perished a son of the night;

ואני shall not have pity concerning Nineveh the great city
אשר has in it more than 120,000 children
אשר do not know between their right hand and left

and much cattle?

Not only by expressing the pronouns but also by placing them first, the writer draws a sharp contrast between Jonah and Yahweh. Additional parallels exist in the structure and words of the two sentences. Each has three clauses, the first introduced by a pronoun and the second and third by the particle אשר . The occurrences of the verb חוס , followed by prepositional phrases, correspond. The stereotyped scheme of the verse is broken by the presence of the phrase "and much cattle" at the end. From a literary viewpoint it is possible to understand this last phrase as the "flaw" which testifies to the genuineness of the structure.[1]

4. Stylistic Characteristics

Most of the stylistic characteristics of Jonah have already been considered in our examination of the External Design and the Internal Structure of the book. Our present task is primarily to summarize and to classify these features.[2]

a. Use of Imagery

The story-teller has command of many images. He is equally adept at depicting varied forms of life. His tale betrays a world-wide perspective.[3] The author knows the geography of the ancient world from Palestine (Joppa) westward to Spain (Tarshish)[4] and eastward to Assyria (Nineveh). He pictures in vivid language the horrors of a storm at sea - the ship tossing to and fro, about to be dashed to pieces by the waves; the frantic efforts of the sailors in hurling wares to the sea and in "digging" to return to dry land. This portrait is not typical of biblical images, since on the whole the Hebrews had little knowledge of or contact with the sea.[1] The author also knows the destructive power of the desert sirocco (4:8) - that dreaded east wind which invades Palestine twice each year and brings misery to the land and to its inhabitants.[2] Plants (4:6) and animals (3:7; 4:7,11) lie within the scope of the narrator's interests. As for royalty, he knows the ways of kings and of nobles, of royal decrees and of obedient subjects. He is acquainted with the widespread practice of lot-casting (1:7).[3] Cultic matters, including fasting, wearing sackcloth, praying, confessing, and sacrificing, are not foreign to him either. All

---

[1] See our remarks supra on "symmetrophobia".

[2] For the arrangement of this material, the writer is indebted to J. Muilenburg, "Introduction and Exegesis to Isaiah, Chs. 40-66," IB V, pp. 386-392.

[3] Wolff, op. cit., col. 854f.

[4] The location of ancient Tarshish is by no means certain (see J. Simon,

---

The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT, p. 88f; C. H. Gordon, "Tarshish" (3), IDB 4, p. 517f. Tartessus in Spain is frequently suggested as the site of biblical Tarshish (see Albright, "New Light on the Early History of Phoenician Civilization," BASOR 83 (Oct. 1941), 21; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 29f; Robinson, HAT, p. 121; Weiser, ATD, p. 217; Feuillet, "Le Livre de Jonas," p. 27). Other suggestions include a site in India near the Persian Gulf (cf. Rinaldi, "Giona," p. 203) and Tarsus in Cilicia (cf. Robinson, HAT, p. 121). Tarshish may also have been the Phoenician name for Nora in Sardinia (see Albright, *op. cit.*, 17-22). Albright thinks that the word itself is Phoenician and means "mine" or "smelting plant", *i.e.*, a loan word from Accadian **taršîšu* ("refinery"), derived from *rašâšu* ("to melt, be smelted"); see also K-B, p. 1042; K-B, *Supplementum ad Lexicon*, p. 194. Note that T rendered *Tarshish* as *sea* (see Chapter I, p. 15).

[1] See *supra*, p. 210, note 1.

[2] For a description of the sirocco and of its symbolic usages in Scripture, see Denis Baly, *The Geography of the Bible*, pp. 67-70. On the religious significance of the desert in the ancient world, see A. Haldar, "The Notion of the Desert in Sumero-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions".

[3] On lot-casting to determine a person, cf. I Sam. 14:40-46 and Acts 1:26. See also Joh. Lindblom, "Lot-casting in the Old Testament," VT XII, No. 2 (April, 1962), 164-178.

these many and varied images the narrator has skillfully woven together in his tale.

b. Sentences: structure and kinds

Certain patterns persist in the structure of sentences. We have noted repeatedly that many sentences are formed with three major clauses, or with three main verbs. The continual occurrence of this structure provides a certain rhythm to the narrative which in turn facilitates the grasping of the content. A similar observation may be made about those sentences which are constructed as concentric circles. Their organization is no small aid to the hearer, who through the structure better grasps and remembers the content.

Another characteristic of certain sentences in Jonah is the reversal of the usual Hebrew order of words for the purpose of making contrasts and/or emphases. In 1:4 the subject 'Yahweh' appears first. This arrangement points up the futility of Jonah's trying to flee "from the presence of Yahweh" (1:3) and stresses Yahweh's power over the sea. In 1:5 the subject 'Jonah' precedes the verb in order to contrast the behavior of Jonah with that of the sailors. In 1:9 the direct object of the verb stands first in the clause for emphasis, i.e., "Yahweh, God of the heavens, I am fearing...." The use and location of the pronouns אתה and אני in 4:10-11 also provide a striking contrast between Jonah and Yahweh. In all these cases the re-arrangement of the usual order of the sentences expresses special nuances in the meaning of the story.

In the dialogue[1] of the tale two kinds of sentences predominate: interrogatives and imperatives. Included in the first category are indirect questions, rhetorical questions and/or exclamations as well as direct inquiries. Altogether fifteen such questions occur. At least one question appears on the lips of every character in the story; the vast majority of the questions are addressed to Jonah. The captain's exclamation to Jonah, "What to you, sleeping!" (1:6), is followed by two indirect questions when the mariners seek the cause of their distress (1:7,8a). Next comes a series of short queries in which the sailors demand to know all about Jonah (1:8). Having listened to the answer of the prophet, they respond in great astonishment, "What is this you have done!" (1:10).[1] This exclamation they follow with a direct question, "What shall we do to you?" (1:11). In Chapter 3 there appear two questions: the indirect query which follows the verb ראה in 4:5,[2] and the rhetorical "who knows" in the royal edict (3:9). In Chapter 4 Jonah first tosses an accusatory question at Yahweh: "Was not this my word while I was in my country?" (v 2). Yahweh's reply to Jonah is yet another question: "Is anger good to you?" (v 4).[3] He repeats this question when next he speaks to Jonah (v 9), and His third encounter with the prophet is also a question (4:10-11). As the concluding sentence of the book, this last question is the "punch-line" of the entire story. Brief, incisive, and pointed are the many questions which occur throughout the book. Their frequency and their sharpness are

---

[1] Lods notes the significance of dialogue as embodying teaching. He

---

observes that this device is used often in ancient Near Eastern tales; e.g., the Egyptian "Eloquent Peasant" and the Assyrian "Romance of Ahiqar" (The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism, p. 336f). For these and other examples, see ANET.

[1] Cf. Yahweh's question to Eve in Gen. 3:13 and to Cain in 4:10. Cf. also Gen. 12:18; 29:25; 26:10.

[2] For similar constructions, see Gen. 2:19; 37:20; Num. 13:10; Hab. 2:1.

[3] Cf. Gen. 4:6.

striking to the hearer of the tale.[1] The questions arouse one to know, to perceive, and to comprehend what is urgent, what is shocking, and what is important. The directness of many of these questions brings the reader into the story as a participant. This fact is especially true of the final question. Since it is left unanswered, it demands a response from all who hear it. The use of questions, then, is a most significant didactic device.

The imperatives in *Jonah* are also numerous and instructive, from Yahweh's opening command to Jonah (1:2; cf. 3:2) all the way to Jonah's final request of Yahweh (4:2). Occasionally two commands stand side by side, as in 1:2, 1:6, and 3:2. Imperatives are found on the lips of Yahweh (1:2; 3:2), of the captain (1:6), of the sailors (1:7,8) and of Jonah (1:12; 4:2). Interestingly, Jonah's two demands are both for death: "Pick me up and hurl me to the sea," he requests of the sailors. "Take my life from me," he prays to Yahweh. These commands make clear Jonah's wish to die rather than to accept the will of Yahweh. Related to imperative sentences are cohortatives and jussives. These are used chiefly in the royal edict (3:7-8; see also 1:7).

c. Vocabulary

The vocabulary of *Jonah* is not large. A few basic words are used repeatedly throughout the book. Yet the vocabulary also contains a number of unusual words and words used in unusual ways. The terms ספינה (1:5), קריאה (3:2), and חרישית (4:8) occur only here in the OT. The employment of the *verb* עשת (1:6) is also unique; for a parallel expression, cf. Ps. 40:18, where the verb used is חשב . In *Jonah* alone the verb חשב is attached to an inanimate subject. Four words which occur only a few times throughout the entire OT are employed in a unique sense by the author of the book: a) שתק as applied to the sea; b) חתר in the sense of 'rowing'; c) זעף to describe the sea; d) טעם only here in the Hebrew sections of the OT to mean a royal decree. In addition, the noun מַלָח is found only in Jon. 1:5 and in Ez. 27:9,27,29; the noun חֹבֵל only in Jon. 1:6 and in Ez. 27:8,27,28,29.

---

[1] Wolff, *op. cit.*, col. 854f.

Apart from considerations of linguistic milieu and date, these peculiarities in vocabulary reveal elements in the style of our narrator and also the distinctiveness of the subject matter with which he is dealing. To ascribe thought to a ship (1;4) adds vividness to its plight in the storm (cf. Is. 23:1);[1] to speak of rowing as 'digging' (1:13) similarly creates a vital picture for the hearer. Moreover, in Chapter I where the description of the sea, the mariners, and storm is not typical of Hebrew imagery, it is not surprising that we find Hebrew words used in unparalleled or unusual ways. The subject matter is responsible for the peculiarities in the vocabulary. Like the imagery in the legend, the vocabulary indicates that our narrator has a wide knowledge of his world. It also demonstrates a creative use of words. It is a vocabulary which is at the same time common and simple, varied and unique.

d. Repetitions

If the fashioner of our legend has one dominant stylistic characteristic, it is the use of repetition. This literary feature applies both to single words and to larger sections.

---

[1] For a discussion of the phenomenon of personification, see E. König, *Stilistik*, *Rhetorik*, *Poetik*, p. 105ff.

1) Single words. a) Verbs: ידע is used three times in Section A (1:7,10,12) and three in Section B (3:9; 4:2,11); likewise, קרא in 1:2,6,14 and in 3:2,4,5. The form קום appears twice in Section A 9(1:2;6) and once in Section B (3:20), and the form ויקם once in Section A (1:3) and twice in Section B (3:1,6). Moreover, the repetition of these verbs is symmetrical in design. Additional repetitions include: טול in 1:4, 5,12,15. שוב in 1:13; 3:8,9(twice),10. עשה in 1:9,10,11,14; 3:10(twice); 4:4. נחם in 3:9,10; 4:2. מנה in 2:1; 4:6,7,8. בוא in 1:3(twice),9; 3:4, הלך in 1:2,7,11,13; 3:2,3. אבד in 1:6,14; 3:9; 4:10. ישב in 4:4;,9(twice). ירא in 1:5,9,10,16.

b) Nouns and adjectives: רעה in 1:2,7,8(twice); 3:8, 10(twice); 4:1,2,6. יבשה in 1:9,13; 2:11. נפש in 1:14; 4:3,8. חרה in 4:4,9(twice); cf. 4:1. ים in 1:4(twice),5,9,11(twice),12(twice),13, 15(twice). As an adjective and noun the root גדל appears fourteen times throughout the book: 1:2,4(twice),10,12,16; 2:1; 3:1,3,5,7; 4:1,6,11 (cf. 4:10).

c) Prepositions: The preposition על is used repeatedly:[1] 1:2;5;7,12,13,14(twice); 3:6(twice),10; 4:2(twice),6(three),8,9,10,11. To a lesser extent the author seems to show a fondness for the preposition ל ; cf. especially ליונה and לו in 4:6.

2) Phrases and clauses.

to flee to Tarshish: 1:3; 4:2 (cf. 1:10)

the presence of Yahweh: 1:2,3(twice),10

that the sea may be quiet: 1:11,12 (cf. 1:15) the sea was more and more tempestuous: 1:11,13

---

[1] See James Kennedy, op. cit., p. 30.

pick ... and hurl to the sea: 1:12,15

call to Yahweh(God): 1:6,14; 3:8

prayed to Yahweh: 2:2; 4:2

Is anger good to you? 4:4,9

3) One peculiar type of repetition is the exact correspondence between certain verbs and nouns. The thought of a verb is expressed again in a noun formed from it. Most often these nouns serve as cognate objects:

afraid a great fear: 1:10,16

vowed vows: 1:16

sacrificed sacrifices: 1:16

proclaim the proclamation: 3:2

it was evil a great evil: 4:1

rejoiced a great joy: 4:6

As we have frequently remarked, the stylistic device of repetition emphasizes the primary themes of our story.[1] It shows us where the stress is to be laid, and it gives unity and simplicity to the narrative.[2]

e. Assonance

Although assonance[3] does not play a major role in the stylistic characteristics of Jonah, it is present in several places. One of these is the alliterative sound in the phrase חִשְּׁבָה לְהִשָּׁבֵר . This phrase is a vivid one, portraying the ship as alive and animated. The sound calls attention to the uniqueness of the expression and thereby gives force to it. Another possible example of assonance is the phrase עִבְרִי אָנֹכִי . The identical sound of the endings of these two words links them together emphatically. It is certainly noteworthy that this phrase is the first utterance in the book by Jonah himself. Here the prophet identifies himself not only in terms of people but also in terms of religion. A third case of assonance is contained in the cultic confession of 4:2: חַנּוּן וְרַחוּם .[1] There is correspondence between the similarity in the sounds of these words and the similarity in their meanings. In each of these three instances we have two successive words with similar sounds. Aesthetically the sound appeals to the ear, and as a didactic device it is easily remembered by the hearer. Thus it is hardly coincidental that in each of these three phrases something unusual or important is being said. Assonance effects emphasis.[2]

---

[1] On repetition as originating from religious rather than from aesthetic concerns, see Martin Buber, The Prophetic Faith, p. 9.

[2] See H. Gunkel, The Legends of Genesis, p. 71; and J. Muilenburg, "Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," op. cit., pp. 99-103.

[3] See P. P. Saydon, "Assonance in Hebrew as a Means of Expressing Emphasis," Biblica, 36 (1955), 36-50.

A different kind of assonance may be present in the preponderance of the preposition lamedh in 4:6. It may be difficult to discern whether this phenomenon is intentional or accidental. There is a certain pattern, however, in the structure of eight of these lamedhs: a) The first two occur at the end of successive words whose final sounds are identical (וַיַּעַל | מֵעַל). b) The next two occur at the beginning of successive words as prepositions for a noun and for an infinitive, respectively (לְיוֹנָה לִהְיוֹת). c) Like the first, the third pair appears at the end of successive words (צֵל עַל־רֹאשׁוֹ). d) Like the second, the fourth pair appears at the beginning of successive words as prepositions for an infinitive and a pronoun, respectively (לְהַצִּיל לוֹ). Since we have heretofore established symmetry as a dominant literary feature of *Jonah*, one is inclined to view this particular arrangement of *lamedhs* as characteristic of the style of the narrator. The alliterative structure would seem to support the present text.

---

[1] Saydon thinks it doubtful whether this assonance is intentional or not (ibid., p. 49). But see now R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f", VT XIII (Jan. 1963), 40.

[2] Cf. Saydon, op. cit., p. 38: "To an intense feeling or to a vivid idea there should correspond an intense form of expression."

5. Conclusions

Our studies of the literary characteristics of *Jonah* have led to a number of observations about many different facets of the book. For instance, they have thrown light on such textual matters as the correctness of the Masoretic pointing of the verb חִשְּׁבָה (1:4), the correctness of the Hebrew reading עברי אנכי in 1:9, *contra* LXX, and the possible justification of the *lamedh*-structures in 4:6. An understanding of the External Design of the book resolves a problem of composition by confirming the validity of the transposition of 4:5 to follow 3:4. From a purely literary and aesthetic point of view we have witnessed the artistic genius of the fashioner of this legend. Moreover, we have seen numerous phenomena which testify to the oral character of our material:[1] a stereotyped style; the use of repetition in words, phrases, and ideas; and the presence of rhythm and/or euphony in the structures of phrases, sentences, and larger units.

---

[1] On the whole matter of oral tradition, see E. Nielsen, *Oral Tradition* (1954), esp. p. 36 for a discussion of the formal criteria by which oral tradition may be distinguished from written material. See also Albright, FSAC, pp. 64-67; cf. S. Mowinckel, *Prophecy and Tradition*, pp. 15ff, 26f; G. Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*; I. Engnell, *The Call of Isaiah*, pp. 54-64. For specific consideration of *Jonah* as oral tradition, see H. Birkeland, *Zum Hebräischen Traditionswesen*, p. 71.

Surely the present composition preserves oral tradition.[1] Above all, our form-critical studies have revealed in striking ways the major emphases and the central themes of the story; *e.g.*, the significance of 4:2 in the Design and Structure of the book. An examination of literary characteristics has not simply directed us to the meaning of the narrative; it has explicitly shown us that meaning.

D. *Sitz im Leben*

Having studied the literary form of *Jonah* and having described its literary characteristics, we turn now to a third concern of Form Criticism: the search for the *Sitz im Leben* of this midrashic legend. Our interest here lies in how the story may have been used in its original setting.

In general it is not easy to determine *Sitz im Leben*. Gunkel maintained that the original use of literature might be discerned through clues provided in both form and content.[2] On particular occasions one spoke in particular ways; certain patterns and formulae of speech are thus indicative of certain occasions.[3] Moreover, what is said may allude to the occasion on which it is said; the use of a composition may be disclosed in its content.[4] Accordingly, our task is to endeavor to understand the original place and function of *Jonah* in the post-exilic period on the basis of an examination of its form and content. Yet the clues given in such an examination are not conclusive. They lead in several directions and are subject to diverse interpretations. We propose not to advance and defend one theory about the Sitz im Leben of the book but rather to present and explore possibilities as they pertain to prophecy, to cult, and to wisdom literature.

---

[1] "Much of the Old Testament was originally spoken, and the stamp of its original spokenness is deeply impressed upon it " (J. Muilenburg, *The Way of Israel*, p. 18).

[2] See the references on p. 122, note 1.

[3] Muilenburg, *The Way of Israel*, p. 29.

[4] Bentzen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 108ff; Hahn, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-150.

1. Jonah and prophecy

Although it differs markedly from other Latter Prophets,[1] the book of Jonah is a part of the prophetic canon. It seems insufficient to say, as do Budde[2] and Vriezen,[3] that the story was perhaps included among the Minor Prophets in order to round off the number twelve. The fact that the central human figure in this legend was also an historical prophet accounts more convincingly for its place among the Twelve.[4] Furthermore, in spirit and in meaning Jonah is not alien to the prophetic tradition.[5] Its content echoes such prophecies as Jeremiah and Ezekiel.[6] Whatever its specific function in post-exilic Judaism, Jonah was reckoned as prophetic literature.

2. Jonah and the cult

In recent scholarship it has been increasingly recognized that a sharp dichotomy between prophet and priest cannot be maintained.[1] While it is a moot point whether or not the canonical prophets are to be linked or identified with cultic prophets,[2] it is generally averred that the former were not unrelated to the cultus.[3] In fact, some of the prophetic oracles among the Twelve may have been designed and used as cultic liturgies.[4] Be that as it may, the acknowledgment of positive relationships between the canonical prophets and the cult provides a background for considering cultic motifs in *Jonah*. This cultic material includes: 1) confessions (1:9; 4:2);[5] 2) communal laments (1:14; cf. 3:7-8) and other references to praying (1:5,6; 2:2; 3:8; 4:2-3); 3) mention of lot-casting (1:7);[6] sacrifices (1:16);[1] vows (1:16);[2] fasting (3:5,7); and sackcloth and ashes (3:5, 6,8); 4) cultic language as illustrated in the prayers and in such terms as "perhaps" (1:6) and "who knows" (3:9).

---

[1] Cf. our introductory remarks on Gattung supra.

[2] Budde, "Jonah," JE VII, p. 229f.

[3] Th. C. Vriezen, Theology of the Old Testament, p. 68.

[4] E. Haller, op. cit., p. 8; D. B. MacDonald, The Hebrew Literary Genius, p. 123; Gray, op. cit., p. 215; Bleek, op. cit., p. 179.

[5] Weiser, The OT, p. 251; G. Östborn, Cult and Canon, p. 59: Haller, op. cit., p. 11; Sellin, Introduction, p. 174.

[6] See Feuillet, "Le Livre de Jonas," p. 16f; Brockington, "Jonah," Peake's Commentary, p. 627.

---

[1] For discussions of this topic, including the relevant literature, see, *inter alia*, H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study," HTR 38 (1945), 12-16; O. Eissfeldt, "The Prophetic Literature," OTMS, pp. 119-126; Rowley, "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, pp. 240-60.

[2] A. Haldar makes no distinction between cultic and canonical prophets (*Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semitics*, esp. pp. 90-160), but this view is rejected by many scholars; cf., e.g., T. Meek, *Hebrew Origins*, p. 178ff; Rowley, "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," *op. cit.*, p. 251; B. D. Napier, "Prophet," IDB III, p. 900f.

[3] Cf. S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien* III, pp. 1-29; A. R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*; H. W. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*, pp. 222-230; J. Pedersen, "The Rôle Played by Inspired Persons among the Israelites and the Arabs," *Studies in OT Prophecy*, pp. 127-142.

[4] On Joel see A. Kapelrud, *Joel Studies* (1948); Weiser, *The OT*, p. 240; cf. T. H. Robinson, HAT, p. 59ff. On Micah see H. Gunkel, "The Close of Micah: a Prophetic Liturgy," *What Remains of the Old Testament*, pp. 115-149. On Nahum see P. Humbert, "Le probleme du livre de Nahoum," RHPR 12 (1932), 1-15; cf. A. Haldar, *Studies in the Book of Nahum* (1947). On Habakkuk see P. Humbert, *Problemes du livre d'Habacuc* (1944). On Zephaniah see G. Gerleman, *Zephanja textkritisch und literarisch untersucht* (1942).

[5] See "Literary Characteristics" *supra*.

[6] Lindblom, "Lot-Casting in the OT," VT (April, 1962), 164-178.

In addition to these cultic reminiscences in both the form and the content of *Jonah*, several other factors may link the book with worship in the post-exilic period. a) The psalm which has been inserted in Chapter 2 is clearly a cultic hymn.[3] One may speculate if its presence in *Jonah* suggests a cultic use for the entire prophecy. b) It is known that *Jonah* was used in Jewish worship during Mishnaic times. Tractate Taanith reports that on the final days of fasting the elders quoted from Jon. 3:10:[4]

> Brethren, it is not written of the men of Nineveh that 'God saw their sackcloth and their fasting,' but *And God saw their works that they turned from their evil way*....

c) *Jonah* is the Haphtaroth for the afternoon service on Yom Kippur.[5] At least one writer has claimed that the book was originally composed to be read on this occasion.[6]

---

[1] On sacrifices and the cult, see de Vaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 415-456. See also H. H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament." Note that the sacrifices offered by the sailors in *Jonah* are not a part of a cultic scene; cf. Köhler, *Old Testament Theology*, p. 191f.

[2] On the vow (ndr), see de Vaux, *op. cit.*, p. 465f; Köhler, *OT Theology*, pp. 191-192.

[3] On the cultic provenance of the psalm, see A. R. Johnson, "Jonah II.3-10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy," *Studies in OT Prophecy*, esp. p. 83; Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, pp. 135-137; von Rad, "Der Prophet Jona," p. 13; E. Haller, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[4] H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, p. 195.

[5] See Geden and Kilgour, *Introduction to the Ginsburg Edition*, p. 32; Cohen, *The Twelve Prophets*, p. 137; Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year*, pp. 170-177; S. B. Hoenig and S. Rosenberg, *A Guide to the Prophets*, pp. 128-130; I. G. Dobsevage, "Hafṭarah," JE VI, p. 137.

[6] F. C. Burkitt, "The Prophets of Israel," *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, p. 431. Burkitt's claim is erroneous; see *infra*.

From the evidence cited above, it is beyond dispute that Jonah contains cultic material and that the little book has been and continues to be used in cultic situations. Yet it is doubtful if this information provides us with any substantial clues for determining the original Sitz im Leben. The fact that the story has cultic motifs only shows that the author was familiar with and utilized material drawn from the worship of his people; it does not demonstrate that the story itself was originally designed for use in worship. A similar conclusion must be drawn about the data provided by the psalm, by the Mishnah, and by the service on Yom Kippur. That a cultic hymn was inserted into Jonah sometime after the composition of the prose narrative may tell us something of a later use to which the present book was put, but it sheds no light on the original function of the narrative. It might even be argued that the psalm was added in order to make the story more suitable for cultic use, in which case the insertion would tell us that the prose narrative originally had no specific cultic connections. The one reference to Jonah in the Mishnah is too late to tell us anything about the original Sitz im Leben of the prophecy. Similarly, the connection of Jonah with Yom Kippur is not attested before the second century A.D.[1] Thus this reference has no bearing on the question under consideration here.

So far we have seen that Jonah is a prophetic book which contains cultic motifs. While these data may fall in line with the results of recent research pointing out positive contacts between prophet and priest in OT times, they do not really illuminate the *Sitz im Leben* of *Jonah*.

---

[1] Cf. A. Büchler, "Haftarah," JE VI, p. 136; according to Dr. T. H. Gaster, the earliest reference to Jonah as a Haphtaroth for Yom Kippur is to be found in the Tosefta, addition to Mishnah Megilla, dated in the 2nd century A.D. (oral communication).

3. *Jonah* and wisdom literature

Another area to be investigated is the possible relationship of *Jonah* to wisdom literature. Just as the old dichotomy between prophet and priest is no longer justified, so a sharp differentiation between prophecy and wisdom literature is also questionable. To be sure, in many ways it is difficult to reconcile the wisdom movement with the main stream of Israelite faith.[1] Nevertheless, it is increasingly recognized that this movement was not altogether the result of foreign influences upon Israel's thinking, but it was also an authentic part of her faith even from early times.[2] More specifically, there was mutual interaction between prophecy and wisdom,[3] as well as between wisdom and the cult.[4]

In the light of these facts, it is instructive to observe that *Jonah* shows affinities with wisdom material. Indeed some scholars have characterized this prophecy as *Weisheitsdichtung*.[5] Similarities between *Jonah* and wisdom literature include the following:

---

[1] See, *inter alia*, O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*; W. Baumgartner, "The Wisdom Literature," OTMS, p. 210f; G. E. Wright, *God Who Acts*, pp. 102-105; H. W. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation*, pp. 231-261; Muilenburg, *Way of Israel*, pp. 98-106.

[2] Cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 237: "There was both a native nucleus and a foreign contribution in the case of Israel's Wisdom."

[3] See J. Lindblom, "Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets," VT Supplement III, pp. 192-204; Samuel Terrien, "Amos and Wisdom," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 108-115, esp. 108f, 115. von Rad, *Theology* I, p. 428 esp. note 26; cf. E. Gerstenberger, "The Woe-Oracles of the Prophets," JBL 81 (Sept, 1962), esp. 261-263.

[4] See von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 433ff.

[5] See esp. Haller, *op. cit.*, p. 8: "Die Jona-erzählung ist eine Lehrdichtung, die viel näher zur poetischen Weisheitsdichtung und Weisheitsliteratur gehört als etwa zu den klassichen Prophetenbüchern." Cf. also H. W. Wolff, "Jonabubh," *op. cit.*, col. 855. See now R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f," VT XIII (Jan. 1963), 50, note 5: "It seems probable that Jonah should be classified among the wisdom writings rather than among the prophets."

a) Unlike most of the prophetic literature,[1] *Jonah* is not related to a particular time and a particular historical situation. Like most of the psalms[2] and the wisdom literature,[3] *Jonah* lacks a precise historical context. This point was made clear by the difficulties which we encountered in dating the book. To attach the story to a concrete historical situation is simply impossible. It has a general validity tather than a specific point of reference.[4] This characteristic definitely distinguishes *Jonah* from other prophetic literature[5] and would tend to associate it with wisdom traditions.

b) Wisdom literature is not only timeless in quality; it is international in scope.[6] Even though it flourished most vigorously in Egypt, no one ancient peoples had a monopoly on it. Wise men were to be found in many cultures. Moreover, these sages exhibited a knowledge of and concern with the entire world of their time. Bentzen calls them "mediators of an international culture".[1] The content of their wisdom disclosed an acquaintance with many facets of the ancient world. To some extent this kind of knowledge is also present in Jonah. The materials of which it is composed indicate that the story-teller himself possessed a cosmopolitan perspective.[2] He knows the geography of the ancient world from Spain to Mesopotamia; he is acquainted with travel to foreign places;[3] and he can report of sea-faring experiences. From the ways of the sea to the life of royal courts, he speaks in a wide context. He shows a great interest in animals, including fish, sheep, cattle, and worms.[4] All sorts and conditions of men lie within the scope of his knowledge: a sea-captain and his pagan crew; a king and his nobles; citizens of a great city and their children. Our author is concerned about all men, be they Hebrews or heathen.[5]

---

[1] Cf. H. H. Rowley, "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," *op. cit.*, p. 253: "Most of the oracles in the prophetic books arose out of a given historical situation and were directed to people who lived in that situation. It is, of course, impossible to attach a precise date to the individual oracles, but the work of each prophet bears the marks of the period in which he lived."

[2] See Rowley, *ibid.*, p. 253f.

[3] Cf. Robinson, *Inspiration and Revelation*, p. 238f: "The Wisdom writers do not concern themselves with history as such...." Cf. also Wright, *God Who Acts*, p. 103; von Rad, Theology, I, pp. 446, 449,452.

[4] von Rad, "Jona," p. 11f.

[5] See Haller, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

[6] See, e.g., the specimens in ANET, "Didactic and Wisdom Literature," pp. 405-452; W. F. Albright, "Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom," VT Supplement III, pp. 1-5; S. H. Blank, "Wisdom," IDB 4, p. 855.

c) In their teachings wise men made frequent use of the varied phenomena of nature.[6] They derived examples and advice for human existence from observing the ways of nature,[7] and they explored the place of nature in relationship to revelation.[1] The author of *Jonah* also discloses a great interest in nature, especially in its didactic and theological meanings. Throughout the legend Yahweh is depicted as Lord of the sea and the dry land (cf. 1:9) who uses nature as He wills to accomplish His purposes. Yahweh hurls a great storm on the sea (1:4); Yahweh prepares a great fish to swallow Jonah (2:1) and later commands the fish to evict Jonah (2:11). Yahweh appoints a *qiqayon* for shade over Jonah (4:6) and also a worm to destroy the plant (4:7); he appoints the *sirocco* and then permits the sun to cause discomfort to the prophet (4:8). He shows pity not only upon men but also upon animals (4:11; cf. 3:7-8). His final question to the prophet involves in part the relationship between human nature and nature:

---

[1] Bentzen, op. cit., I, p. 171.

[2] See our remarks on the "Use of Imagery" supra.

[3] See Bentzen, op. cit., I, p. 171.

[4] On the extent of animal interest in the ancient world and its importance for the OT, see Bodenheimer, op. cit., esp. pp. 196-202.

[5] Cf. Rankin, op. cit., p. 50: "Universalistic thought does appear in the Old Testament, in second Isaiah, in the Psalms, in the Book of Jonah. The Wisdom literature was its foster-mother."

[6] See passim the texts given in ANET; in the OT see, e.g., I Kgs. 4:33; Judges 9:8ff; Prov. 6:6-8; 23:31-32; 26:1-3; 28:15; 30:24-31; Eccl. 12:1-5; 3:19. See also Lindblom, "Wisdom in the OT Prophets," op. cit., p. 200f; Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation, p. 238.

[7] See von Rad, Theology, I, pp. 424ff; C. Rylaarsdam, Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature.

> And the Lord said, 'You pity the plant, for which you did not labor,[2] nor did you make it grow, which came into being in a night, and perished in a night.

On the basis of this relationship Yahweh draws a comparison to the divine love:

> And should not I pity Nineveh, that great city, in which there are more than a hundred and twenty thousand persons who do not know their right hand from their left, and also much cattle?

Thus from beginning to end nature plays a dominant role as the instrument of Yahweh. He works in and through it to present the opportunity of salvation to Nineveh and to teach Jonah the character of divine compassion. This use of nature in *Jonah* has been compared specifically to the teachings of the Egyptian Amen-em-ope.[3] In general it is certainly one major similarity between our legend and wisdom literature.

---

[1] von Rad, *op. cit.*, p. 449ff.

[2] Note that apart from Jon. 4:10 and Ps. 127:1 the *verb* עמל occurs only in wisdom passages: e.g., Prov. 16:26; Eccl. 1:3, 2:21, 5:17, *etc.* For a complete list, see BDB, p. 765 and K-B, p. 715.

[3] Rankin, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

d) Within the narrative of Jonah runs a thread of lightness and of humor. It cannot be claimed that these qualities are unique marks of wisdom materials. To whatever extent humor is present in the OT, it is not confined to any single group of writings. Moreover, humor for the sake of humor is alien to the over-all serious Tendenz of Scripture.[1] It is not used in order to entertain. It may be employed as a pedagogical device, a vehicle for teaching a divine message.[2] Beyond its didactic value, humor may have theological intent. It can involve the hearers in the message being proclaimed and confront them with the necessity of response. Associated with humor, though not necessarily humorous, are puns, irony, and satire. Since wisdom literature does contain such elements,[3] it is not altogether inappropriate to consider the humor of Jonah in this context.

Von Rad has said that one cannot read Jonah without laughing.[4] The entire story is told with a touch of lightness; yet that lightness has its caustic edge. In 1:3 Jonah tries to flee from the presence of Yahweh. This verse is so constructed that his efforts to escape are surrounded by the phrase "presence of God". The very structure of the sentence discloses the impossibility of escape and points up the ridiculous behavior of the prophet. From the start Jonah is "kicking against the pricks". This irony is apparent in the discrepancy between Jonah's action in 1:3 and his confession in 1:9. He endeavors to flee from the presence of Yahweh whom he acknowledges to be the "God of the heavens who made the sea and the dry land"! A certain irony may be also intended in 1:6 where a heathen sea-captain urges a Hebrew prophet to pray.[1] Through his flight Jonah has made a mockery of God's command. Now in turn the words of the captain mock Jonah. The disobedient prophet who has turned away from his God is here urged to call upon his god. Nowhere does the narrator state openly this theme of mockery; rather he is a master of the art of disguise.[2] The irony of the situation is skillfully suggested; it is not explicitly told.

---

[1] W. F. Stinespring, "Humor," IDB 2, p. 660; M. Burrows, Outline of Biblical Theology, p. 291f; M. Shutter, Wit and Humor of the Bible, p. 2f.

[2] R. Voeltzel, "Ironie Biblique a l'Egard de l'Homme," Foi et Vie 51 (1953), 208-237, esp. 208ff, 234-37.

[3] See Stinespring, op. cit., p. 661; cf. von Rad, Theology I, p. 423.

[4] von Rad, "Jona," p. 10f; cf. Shutter, op. cit., p. 39ff.

Some commentators[3] have observed an incongruity between Jonah's reluctance to preach to the Ninevites and his apparent concern for the heathen crew of the ship, a concern which goes to the full extent of offering to sacrifice his life (1:12) in order that they might be saved. Surely there is irony in this episode, but it is questionable whether it lies precisely at this point. It has been suggested already that Jonah's willingness to die is not a noble and magnanimous sacrifice of his life for the salvation of others; rather it is a desperate attempt to escape God through death.[4] Physical flight (1:3) and sleep (1:5) have been insufficient escape mechanisms; so now the runaway seeks a certain way out: death. If this interpretation be correct, then the irony of the episode lies in the fact that Jonah does not die. His well-laid plans for death are confounded by Yahweh who appoints a fish to swallow him. Given Jonah's psychological make-up, one can see that the fish is not for him an agent of salvation, because by being rescued Jonah has failed to escape the command of Yahweh. From Jonah's perspective death would be the only "salvation" (cf. 4:3,8,9). This "salvation" he is denied by being granted life.

---

[1] See Smart, op. cit., p. 881.

[2] See R. Voeltzel, Das Lachen des Herrn, p. 33; "Ironie Biblique," p. 209.

[3] E.g., Smart, op. cit., p. 872. [4] See Chapter II ad loc.

Another ironic twist is provided by the unequivocable pronouncement of destruction for Nineveh (3:4). This word of absolute doom leads to salvation for the city. Jonah's words effect their opposite. Although told with earnestness, the picture of the repentance of the Ninevites and their animals is touched with humor.[1] How ridiculous to contemplate animals clothed in sackcloth, mourning, and fasting!

The final scene (Ch. 4) between Yahweh and Jonah is particularly noted for its humorous side. The sulking of Jonah reaches the height of absurdity in the incident of the plant.[2] Here the author employs paronomasia when he reports that[3]

> the Lord God appointed a plant, and made it come up over
> Jonah, that it might be a shade over his head
> (להיות צֵל על־ראשו)
> to save him from his discomfort.
> (לְהַצִּיל לו מרעתו)

Von Rad comments that at this point the tale approaches the burlesque.[4] Jonah is an angry little man whom the benevolent Deity gently chides. The final question in the story is in one sense a comparison between the ridiculous andthe sublime. The foolishness of Jonah exposes and is exposed by the love of God.

---

[1] See Voeltzel, *Das Lachen des Herrn*, p. 13.

[2] See Stinespring, *op. cit.*, p. 662.

[3] See I. M. Casonowicz, *Paronomasia in the OT*, p. 74.

[4] von Rad, "Jona," p. 10.

These light and ironic touches in *Jonah* by no means obscure the central theme; they are attendant upon it. Partly through them a serious message is proclaimed. In this light one can correctly speak of the entire book as a satire.[1]

e) What we have described as lightness and humor in the tale of *Jonah* is in keeping with the informality of the style. Elsewhere we have noted that *Jonah* is introduced by a phrase which suggests a conversational method of prophesying.[2] Now conversation is often a mark of wisdom teaching, although, like humor, it is not unique to wisdom traditions. It is known that sages were story-tellers and that they made use of dialogues in their teaching.[3] *Jonah* is an informal tale which abounds in dialogues between the prophet and the mariners (Ch. 1)[4] and between the prophet and Yahweh (Ch. 4).[5] Moreover, the interrogative sentence appears frequently in the conversations. It is not possible to claim that the use of the interrogative is peculiarly characteristic of wisdom literature; this manner of speaking is so prevalent throughout the OT that examples are superfluous.[6]

---

[1] Cf. Stinespring, "Irony," IDB 2, p. 728: "A broad-minded Jew ridicules his own people, represented by the rebellious prophet, Jonah, for their lack of missionary zeal, their prejudice against foreigners, and their failure to understand a God of love." Cf. Burrows, *Outline of Biblical Theology*, p. 292. See now Dentan, *op. cit.*, p. 50 n.5, who sees *Jonah* "as a lampoon directed by a sophisticated 'wise man' against the narrow-minded disciples of the prophets with whom he was familiar."

[2] See "Internal Structure" *supra*.

[3] See Lods, *op. cit.*, pp. 336f; Bentzen, *op. cit.*, I, p. 181.

[4] Cf. the dialogue between Job and his friends.

[5] Cf. the dialogue between Job and God.

[6] Cf. Terrien, *op. cit.*, p. 112; Muilenburg, *Way of Israel*, p. 19f.

Nevertheless, it may be legitimate to say, as does Lindblom, that "the rhetorical question is very characteristic of the Wisdom literature."[1] We have already pointed out the use of this type of question in *Jonah* (cf. 1:6, 10, 3:9; 3:10-11).[2] The concluding sentence of the book is especially significant; it stands as both a message and a challenge to the hearers of the story.

These stylistic features do not in themselves indicate that *Jonah* is associated with wisdom literature. Taken in conjunction with the other evidence adduced, they do contribute to the general impression that *Jonah* reflects a *hokmic* milieu.

f) In a recent article R. C. Dentan argues that the confession in Ex. 34:6f and in parallel passages (e.g., Jon. 4:2) is a product of the wisdom movement in Israel.[3] He maintains that for the most part the vocabulary of this formula is clearly *hokmic*. For instance, the phrase ארך אפים occurs nowhere else except in the Wisdom literature. The root נצר, and especially its singular active participle which appears in the confession, belongs primarily to wisdom books. Similarly, the affinities of the phrase ונקה לא ינקה are "*overwhelmingly with the Wisdom literature*". In addition, Dentan observes that the form of the confession is a series of "propositions". There are no references to the mighty acts of God in history; there are only descriptions of His attributes.[4] Moreover, the confession shows no special concern with Israel, the community of the covenant; it is universalistic in spirit. All these features lead Dentan to conclude that the entire confession comes from "the School of the Wise Men".

---

[1] See Lindblom, *op. cit.*, p. 201f and the biblical passages cited there.

[2] See "Stylistic Characteristics" *supra*.

[3] R. C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f."

[4] Cf. G. E. Wright, *God Who Acts*, p. 85.

This thesis may be challenged at certain points. In part it is an _argumentum e silentio_. The fact that certain words and phrases appear only or primarily in the confessional formula and in the wisdom literature does not prove therefore that the formula itself is sapiential. Since the OT is not a lexicon or concordance of the Hebrew language, conclusions based on the presence and/or absence of words must remain tentative. Literary affinities do not _per se_ denote specific relationships. Furthermore, the study by Dentan does not account adequately for the wide variety of contexts in which this confessional formula appears. If the confession is a product of the Wisdom school, then how can one explain its presence in each of several sections of the Pentateuch (e.g., Ex. 20:5f; Nu. 14:18; Dt. 5:9f, 7:9f), of the Prophets (e.g., Nah. 1:3; Jer. 30:11b, 32:18), and of the non-_hokmic_ Writings (e.g., Neh. 9:17; II Chron. 30:9b; Ps. 103:8)?[1] It would seem that each of these passages must be examined to determine if the presence of the confession can be always accounted for in terms of Dentan's thesis. Moreover, a corollary question presents itself: if the formula is a product of the wisdom school, then how can one account for its absence from the wisdom literature itself? Nowhere is the confession quoted in the sapiential material.[2]

---

[1] Dentan attempts to answer this question in part by suggesting that the Wise Men were responsible for the final redaction of the Pentateuch and of the Psalter (_op. cit._, p. 49f).

[2] See Dentan's list, _op. cit._, p. 34.

Whatever the weaknesses of Dentan's thesis, he has demonstrated certain points of contact between this confession and wisdom literature. These similarities are particularly appealing in regard to Jonah. They harmonize with other evidence which we have cited to show that Jonah reflects a sapiential milieu. In this respect the study by Dentan enhances our contention. And in turn our evidence may lend weight to the view that the confession found in Jon. 4:2, the heart of the legend,[1] is not unrelated to the wisdom school.

Thus far our studies indicate that Jonah contains prophetic, cultic, and sapiential motifs. In this little book are blended the word of the prophet, the concern of the priest, and the counsel of the wise (cf. Jer. 18:18). The first two areas have not provided us with any substantial clues to the original Sitz im Leben of Jonah. It remains to be seen what light the third area - the many affinities between Jonah and wisdom literature - may shed on this topic.

4. Jonah and the Sodh

E. Haller has proposed that the hokmic character of Jonah indicates a setting in the sodh of post-exilic Israel.[2] The term sodh is used in the OT for both divine and human assemblies.[3] It may also mean the decisions or counsel which comes out of these assemblies.[4] In reference to Jonah Haller has in mind the human council. He describes it as "den Kreis von Männern, die zusammensitzen".[1] L. Köhler depicts it as "the free meeting together in time of leisure of the adult men...."[2] Perhaps it came at the end of the day when men gathered around the campfire to sing, to tell stories, and to hand down ancient wisdom. In this intimate circle of friends the narrator and the poet, the teacher and the sage had their places. There the professional story-tellers spoke.[3] The sodh may well have been the "place in life" of much of the wisdom literature as well as of popular legends.[4]

---

[1] Cf. Dentan, op. cit., p. 50. [2] Haller, op. cit., p. 10.

[3] On the divine assembly see, e.g., Jer. 23:18,21,22; Ps. 25:14; 89:8; Job 15:8. On the human assembly see, e.g., Jer. 6:11; 15:17; Gen. 49:6; Job 19:19; Ps. 111:1.

[4] See, e.g., Amos 3:7; Prov. 15:22. Cf. Terrien, op. cit., p. 112.

If such descriptions of the sodh be valid, then it is not difficult to understand Jonah in this setting. The conversational style of our legend fits the informality of this type of gathering. Its cosmopolitan character and its folkloristic elements might have special appeal in a friendly and relaxed gathering. It is not impossible to imagine several voices participating in the telling of the tale, taking the parts of the narrator, of the captain, of the mariners, of the king, of Jonah, and of Yahweh.[5] The light and ironic touches would entertain even as they instruct. The abrupt and surprise ending of the narrative would incite the listeners to understand and to appropriate its message.

As we indicated in our opening remarks, it is not possible to determine for certain the original Sitz im Leben of Jonah. There is simply insufficient evidence. Perhaps the most we can say is that the *sodh* may have been a likely setting for our tale. The reasons for this tentative conclusion may be summarized as follows: The *sodh* was an informal gathering frequently associated in the OT with the wisdom movement;[1] the *hokmic* and informal character of *Jonah* lends itself readily to such a setting. Thus it may be that our midrashic legend was used in the *sodh* as a satire to expose the folly of those who do not embrace a God of love. This last statement anticipates our interpretation of the story; to that topic we turn now.

---

[1] Haller, op. cit., p. 10.

[2] L. Köhler, Hebrew Man, pp. 84-91, esp. p. 87. See also Pedersen, Israel I, pp. 130, 307; cf. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation, pp. 167-170, 280.

[3] See Gunkel, Genesis, 3rd edition, p. xxxi.

[4] Haller, op. cit., p. 10; Köhler, Hebrew Man, p. 91.

[5] Cf. the arrangement of the proverbs by Köhler, op. cit., pp. 88-91.

---

[1] Cf. Terrien, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

CHAPTER IV

An Interpretation

This attempt to interpret the message of *Jonah* is not altogether a new topic. Interpretation has been a part of the foregoing studies. On the one hand, our judgments about critical issues have been interpretations. On the other hand, our critical methods themselves have disclosed interpretations. This latter statement is particularly true of formcritical analyses, where the articulation of form and style has frequently illuminated the *Tendenz* of the author. In this final chapter we draw upon these findings as we seek the meaning(s) of the story.

A. Nehemiah-Ezra and Particularism

Theological studies of biblical passages are subject to numerous hazards. The dangers of distortion are ever present when one endeavors to express the meaning of ancient and alien literature in contemporary and relevant categories.[1] In this regard it would seem that *Jonah* is often treated too cavalierly. Some scholars have been content to extract one theme from the narrative and present it as the message of the book. This theme is usually stated somewhat as follows: *Jonah* is a proclamation of universalism as a polemic against the nationalism and exclusivism inspired by the reforms of Nehemiah and Ezra.[2] Even if we allow for the fact that such a statement is a summary and not a full exposition, nevertheless it is inadequate. Three criticisms are in order: (1) The summary is not altogether accurate; (2) it does not do justice to the variety of motifs in the legend; (3) it does not focus upon the heart of the midrash.

---

[1] See J. Muilenburg, "Is There a Biblical Theology?" USQR 12 (May, 1957), p. 32ff.

[2] Ours is a composite summary; for individual statements of this view, *mutatus mutandis*, see, *inter alia*, T. K, Cheyne, "Jonah: A Study in Jewish Folklore and Religion," TR 57 (1877), pp. 211, 217-18; Orelli, *op. cit.*, p. 68; Budde, JE, p. 230; C. F. Kent, *The Growth and Contents of the OT*, p. 128; Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, p. 440; Bleeker, *op. cit.*, pp. 74-76; 80ff;

The inaccuracy lies in the attempt to read *Jonah* as a critique of the particularism fostered by Nehemiah and Ezra.[1] In the first place, there is no historical evidence to connect *Jonah* with the times of these men.[2] As we have seen, the book is exceedingly difficult to date with precision. It contains no allusions to particular periods and events. Like the Wisdom literature, it reflects no concrete historical setting. Specifically, it contains no reference to the reform measures of the fifth century. Efforts to place *Jonah* in this context are at best inferential, and they do not really illuminate the message of the story. As Eissfeldt observes,[3] the lesson of the book is not dependent upon this milieu. It is intelligible apart from the work of Nehemiah and Ezra.[4]

In the second place, it is questionable to what extent *Jonah* is a critique of particularism. There is a sense in which any proclamation of universalism is *ipso facto* an attack on particularism. Yet it does not follow that *Jonah* was written *for the purpose* of attacking particularism.

Lippl, *op. cit.*, pp. 164f; Driver, *Introduction*, p. 323; Oesterley and Robinson, *Introduction*, p. 375f; Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, p. 588f; Paterson, *op. cit.*, pp. 271-73; Knight, *op. cit.*, 53f; Kuhl, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 174f; Myers, *op. cit.*, p. 160f; Henshaw, *op. cit.*, p. 289f; Brockington, *op. cit.*, p. 627; Vriezen, *Theology*, p. 75; Haller, *op. cit.*, p. 10f; cf. R. Martin-Achard, *Israël et les nations*, pp. 45-48.

[1] On Nehemiah and Ezra, see J. Bright, *A History of Israel*, pp. 362-386.

[2] See Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, p. 495; von Rad, *Theologie* II, p. 304; Loretz, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

[3] Eissfeldt, *op. cit.*, p. 495.

[4] Mowinckel, *Gamle*, p. 660.

This description of the book has been criticized as vague and abstract.[1] The story does not bear the stamp of a polemic.[2] No attack is made on covenant and election.[3] Israel as a nation is not outright indicted for a policy of exclusivism. This latter statement holds true even if it be maintained that Jonah himself is Israel, either in an allegorical sense or in terms of the Hebraic understanding of corporate personality.[4] In the legend Jonah (or Israel) is clearly presented as a disobedient and rebellious prophet who refuses to speak the word of God to a foreign people. Yet it is not at all clear that his refusal stems from an ardent nationalism which wills to exclude the heathen from the divine concern. Jonah shows no devotion to his own people; zeal for his own country does not enter the picture. Nor does he display an attitude of hatred toward foreigners at any point in the story. In Chapter 1[5] Jonah depends upon the heathen to take him away from his own country; he proclaims to them the universal power and presence of Yahweh (1:9);[6] and he offers to "save" them by drowning. There may well be irony in this episode, but it is perhaps a mistake to derive it from the idea that Jonah is a nationalist. This idea is not explicitly borne out in the rest of the story. Jonah never berates or condemns Nineveh on his own; he announces her destruction reluctantly (3:3). In his angry prayer of 4:2 he does not mention the city. The reason which he gives for his anger is not that Nineveh has been saved (this is the by-product of his unhappiness) but rather that God repents of evil. Thus the salvation of this foreign city is the occasion for, but not the cause of, Jonah's attitude. The prophet does not say that he hates Nineveh or that he thinks the love of God ought not to be extended to foreigners. This idea may certainly be implied in Jonah's behavior, but it is not the heart of the matter. It is a derivative of the author's main concern. If our author were primarily intent upon attacking particularism, then one might expect to find words to this effect expressed in the book. Instead we find that Jonah never questions the universality of divine love; he shows no tendency to want this love only for himself. His quarrel is not with the extent and meaning of the love of God; it is with the very existence of this love. Jonah cannot bear a love which repents of evil, be it extended to foreigners or to himself (cf. Chapter 4).[1]

---

[1] See Feuillet, "Le Sens...", p. 341; Goitein, op. cit., p. 65f.

[2] Cf. the relevant comments about the book of Ruth by A. S. Herbert in Peake's Commentary, p. 316.

[3] See von Rad, Theologie II, p. 304; "Jona," p. 12.

[4] See H. W. Robinson, "The Hebrew Concept of Corporate Personality," Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments, pp. 49-62.

[5] See Hart-Davies, "The Book of Jonah in the Light of Assyrian Archaeology," JTVI LXIX (1937), p. 236f.

[6] For an exposition of this confession as the message of Judaism to the modern world, see S. Ben-Chorim, Die Antwort des Jona (1956).

In conclusion, then, it would seem that the attempt to interpret Jonah as an attack upon the exclusivism of Nehemiah and Ezra is incorrect. There is no historical evidence to link the book with this particular era. The story was not designed as a polemic, even though its theme of universal love may well have served to refute particularism.[2] The spirit of the narrative transcends polemic. To read the book as centrally concerned with universalism *versus* exclusivism in the time of Nehemiah-Ezra is to interpret it from without rather than from within. It is to fail to comprehend the deeper and more authentic dimensions of the message.

---

[1] See Goitein, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[2] Mowinckel, *Gamle*, p. 660.

B. Motifs of the Legend

Before focusing upon the central message of *Jonah*, we call attention to the variety of motifs throughout the story. It is characteristic of legends to embody levels of meaning; many themes interplay in the creation of the whole.[1] Here it is impossible to explore in detail the many motifs present in *Jonah*.[2] We shall only comment briefly upon some of them.

1) Jonah's resistance to preaching in Nineveh is not an unparalleled theme in Scripture. Moses shrank from speaking to Pharaoh (Ex. 3:10-4:17); Elijah fled from Jezebel (I Kgs. 19:1-4); Jeremiah recoiled from prophesying to the nations (Jer. 1:5f). While circumstances and motives differ, the attempt to withdraw from the divine imperative is present in each of these episodes. The futility of this attempt is also set forth with clarity. A prophet cannot escape the divine command.[3] It is in this context that the phrase "from the presence of Yahweh" (Jon. 1:3) is to be understood. While this phrase has sometimes been interpreted as reflecting the ancient belief that God's presence is confined to the Holy Land,[4] there is little evidence in *Jonah* to support this view (cf., e.g., 1:9). If this were a correct interpretation, then Jonah need not have taken seriously Yahweh's command to

---

[1] See Gunkel, *The Legends of Genesis* and von Rad, *Genesis*, *passim*; S. Mowinckel, "Legend," IDB 3, p. 109.

[2] For verse by verse expositions of the narrative, see the commentaries by Bewer, Robinson, and Weiser; see also Haller, "Die Erzählung"; Ronner, *Das buch Jona*. For conservative expositions see W. Posth, *Es geschah des Herrn Wort*; Zilz, *Der umbarmherzige Prophet*; Ungern-Sternberg, *Der Tag des Gerichtes Gottes*, pp. 137-202.

[3] See van Hoonacker, *op. cit.*, p. 315f; Komlós, *op. cit.*, p. 42; cf. Buber, *Moses*, p. 47.

[4] Nowack, *op. cit.*, p. 194; Wellhausen, *op.cit.*, p. 212; Lanchester, *op. cit.*, p. 56; Bewer, *op. cit.*, p. 30; Weiser, ATD, p. 217.

preach in Nineveh. Jonah flees not because he believes Yahweh is limited to Palestine but precisely because he recognizes Yahweh's power and concern over Nineveh. Hence, the phrase "from the presence of Yahweh" is best understood here as the rejection of the prophetic call.[1] It pertains to disobedience and rebellion, not to geography (cf. Jer. 23:39; 52:3).[2]

Motives for recoiling from the prophetic call are varied. Sometimes a man thinks himself inadequate for the task, as did Moses (Ex. 3:11; 4:10) and Jeremiah (1:6). Other times he may think the content of his message too dreadful to announce (e.g., Amos 7:2,5; cf. Is. 6:11ff). As for Jonah, he is not concerned about his own qualifications; nor does he resist because he is commanded to preach doom. His trouble is the certain knowledge that doom can be averted, since God repents of evil. Whereas some prophets shrank from preaching doom because they saw little or no hope, Jonah shrinks from proclaiming doom because he knows there is hope.[3] Whereas Jeremiah complains on occasion about the wrath of Yahweh (e.g., 20:7ff), Jonah grumbles about the love of God (4:2).[4]

After his mission has been accomplished, Jonah falls into a deep depression. His behavior is not unlike that of Elijah after the famous contest on Mt. Carmel.[5] Knowing that Jezebel seeks his life, Elijah flees south to Beersheba (I Kgs. 19:1-3). Then he withdraws from the city and sits under a broom tree. This picture is reminiscent of Jonah's leaving Nineveh and sitting under a castor-oil plant (4:6). Furthermore, Elijah pleads, as does Jonah, that Yahweh take away his *nephesh* (cf. I Kgs. 19:4 with Jon. 4:3). To be sure, the circumstances behind these identical requests differ: Elijah is suffering from exhaustion and is zealous that God's will prevail; Jonah is suffering from anger and is defiant that God's will has prevailed.[1] But common to both prophets is a mood of "mental passion", a feeling of dejection and self-pity which sometimes marks the spirit of Hebrew man.[2] In each instance Yahweh responds to the depression by a question which he later repeats (I Kgs. 19:9,13;[3] Jon. 4:4,9). The questions confront the prophets with the folly of their self-concern. Moreover, Yahweh does not permit their answers to stand as final; He instructs them further in His will. In both narratives this instruction involves the use of nature: wind, earthquake,fire (I Kgs. 19:11-12) and plant, worm, east wind, sun (Jon. 4:7-8). Cf. also the ravens which feed Elijah (I Kgs. 17:4-6) with the fish which swallows Jonah (2:1,11), the cave on Mt. Horeb (I Kgs. 19:9) with the hut to the east of Nineveh (4:5).

---

[1] See Orelli, *op. cit.*, p. 371f; Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 138f; Robinson, HAT, p. 121; Goitein, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

[2] Cf. the Targum rendering of the phrase "from the presence of Yahweh", i.e.,"from prophesying in the name of Yahweh" (see Chapter I, p.15).

[3] Buber, *Prophetic Faith*, p. 104. [4] Gunkel, "Jona," col. 367.

[5] Note that the Peshitta inserts in Jon. 4:8 words borrowed from I Kgs. 19:4; see textual comments *supra*. Wellhausen thinks that Elijah serves as a model for Jonah in Chapter 4 (*op. cit.*, p. 212f). See also John Kennedy, *The Book of Jonah*, pp. 8,9,12; Lanchester, *op. cit.*, p. 49f; Wolff, *op. cit.*, col. 855.

These comparisons of Jonah with other prophets point up an important theme in the narrative: the relationship between Yahweh and his prophet.[4] A prophet cannot escape the divine imperative. Yahweh's will is accomplished even through a reluctant, rebellious, and angry servant.

---

[1] See Weiser, ATD, p. 225.

[2] For a discussion of this subject, see Köhler, *Hebrew Man*, pp. 101-105.

[3] There are critical problems in the composition of this narrative; vs 9b-11a may be misplaced or interpolated. See, J. Mauchline, "I Kings," *Peake's Commentary*, p. 346; J. Montgomery, *The Books of Kings*, ICC, p. 313.

[4] See Gunkel, "Jona," col. 367; Goitein, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 66.

2) The content and intent of Jonah's brief oracle merits study. The prophet is ordered to tell Nineveh that their evil has come up before God (1:2).[1] Nothing is said in this command about the possibility of repentance and salvation. Upon reaching the city, Jonah preaches unmitigated doom: "Yet forty days and Nineveh will be destroyed" (3:4). The Ninevites receive this message not as a final, immutable decree but rather as a call to repentance. They view it not as fatalistic determinism but as an opportunity for decision.[2] The city chooses to turn from its evil (3:5-8; cf. Jer. 18:7-10). Thus the pronouncement of doom has opened the way for salvation, and it becomes clear that the essence of this prophecy is not woe.[3] Seeing the "turning" of the city, God himself "turns from the evil which he had said he would do to them" (3:10). This divine turning is not mechanically effected by human turning. Our author does not say that man controls salvation or that he can manipulate the divine will by righteous deeds. The king of Nineveh does affirm the possibility that human and divine turning may correspond, but he prefaces his remarks about God's repenting with the little phrase "who knows" (3:9). This same idea is expressed by the captain of the ship who urges Jonah to call upon his god: "Perhaps the god will give a thought to us that we do not perish" (1:6). Presented here is what Buber calls the "perchance" of faith.[4] There is a

---

[1] For a different exegesis of 1:2, see Goitein, op. cit., p. 72. He maintains it ought to be translated, "It came before me to do them evil," i.e., God has decided to punish Nineveh.

[2] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 103f.

[3] Rowley, The Missionary Message of the OT, p. 35; cf. Komlós, op. cit., p. 42; Wright, God Who Acts, p. 86.

[4] Buber, Prophetic Faith, p. 105.

possibility, but no guarantee, that human repentance may avert predicted disaster. The outcome is not determined ultimately, however, by human repentance but by the will of God.[1] Salvation belongs to God alone.[2] "Who knows", or "perchance", He may repent.[3]

3) The burden of cities hangs heavily upon the consciousness of ancient Israel.[4] According to the Yahwist, the murderer Cain built the first city (Gen. 4:17). The Yahwist tells also of God's judgment upon Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 18:20-19:28).[5] The ark narratives (I Sam. 5ff) describe the afflictions visited upon the cities of the Philistines. Against these same cities the prophet Amos addresses an oracle (1:6-8). Hosea recalls the destruction of Admah and Zeboiim as a warning to Israel (11:8; cf. Deut. 29:23). Micah cries out against the sins of Samaria and Jerusalem (1:5-6; 3:12; cf. Jer. 26:18; Ez. 23;4ff). The book of Zephaniah proclaims the *ira Dei* upon Jerusalem "the oppressing city" (cf. 1:4; 3:1 etc.) and upon the cities of the Philistines (2:1-7). It compares the coming destruction of Moab and Ammon to that of Sodom and Gomorrah (2:9). The destruction of Babylon is also likened unto these two cities in Is. 13:19. Both Jerusalem and Babylon come under condemnation in the prophecy of

---

[1] Cf. Vriezen, *op. cit.*, p. 77: "Even moral repentance does not imply that the punishment will be averted, but only the *possibility* that God may reverse His decision (repent)."

[2] See Weiser, ATD, p. 223.

[3] The theme of God's repentance occurs in a variety of contexts in the OT: e.g., Gen. 6:6,7; Ex. 32:14; I Sam. 15:11,35; II Sam. 24:16=I Chron. 21:15; Ps. 106:45; Jer. 26:19; Joel 2:13; Amos 7:3,6. Other passages deny this anthropopathism to God: e.g., Num. 23:19; I Sam. 15:29; Mal. 3:6; cf. Ez. 24:14.

[4] Cf. Muilenburg, *The Way of Israel*, p. 89f.

[5] See von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 207ff.

Jeremiah (e.g., 26:6,11; 50; 51). The poets and the apocalypticists do not forget the cities either (e.g., Ps. 139; Lamentations; Is. 25:2; Dan. 4:30ff; 9:2). This theme continues into the NT where one reads, for instance, of Jesus's weeping over Jerusalem (Mtt. 23:37f) and of the apocalyptic vision about the fall of Babylon (Rome) and the coming of the new Jerusalem (Rev. 3:12; 14:8; 16:19; 20:2).

The concern for Nineveh in Jonah must be viewed in light of this biblical motif of cities. Nineveh figures in several other passages. In the Table of Nations (Gen. 10:8-12) its founding is attributed to Nimrod the mighty hunter. Zephaniah predicts its fall shortly before the fateful year 612 B.C. (2:13-15).[1] Above all, the prophecy of Nahum bitterly attacks Nineveh, describes her evils in vivid detail, and rejoices in her destruction.[2] The city Nineveh is the symbol of cruelty par excellence and thus justly deserves its fate. Several comparisons suggest themselves at this point. a) Zephaniah and Nahum denounce Nineveh and see its destruction as the will of God. The author of Jonah shows compassion on the city and sees its salvation as the will of God. b) Zephaniah and Nahum concentrate exclusively upon the violence of the city. While Jonah refers to evil and violence (1:2; 3:8,10), it does not stress these qualities at all; instead it emphasizes the deep religious conviction of the city. Nineveh believes in God (cf. Gen. 15:6), engages in acts of penance, and repents (3:5-10). c) Zephaniah and Nahum are dealing with the historical Nineveh; our storyteller with a legendary Nineveh. Beyond identity of name and size the two cities can hardly be equated. Thus it is not accurate simply to contrast two prophetic attitudes toward one Nineveh. These attitudes are matched by differences in the spirit of two Ninevehs. To understand our particular story it is perhaps best not to read too much of the historical Nineveh into it. Through the portrayal of a legendary Nineveh our author shows God's mercy upon great cities (cf. esp. 4:10-11).

---

[1] See C. J. Gadd, The Fall of Nineveh, esp. pp. 13-21.

[2] It is a moot point whether Nahum is to be dated before or after 612 B.C. On this and other critical questions, see Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 594-597; Weiser, The OT, pp. 256-258, plus the literature cited there.

4) The narrative is dominated and determined by the activity of Yahweh.[1] His lordship and power are strongly affirmed over all the world. He acts; his creation reacts. This theme can be traced throughout the tale:

Yahweh speaks.
  Jonah flees.

Yahweh hurls a great wind.
  The sea, the ship, the sailors, and Jonah respond
  in various ways.

Yahweh appoints a great fish.
  The fish swallows Jonah.
  Jonah prays.

Yahweh speaks to the fish.
  The fish expels Jonah.

Yahweh speaks to Jonah.
  Jonah goes to Nineveh.

Yahweh speaks through Jonah.
  Jonah withdraws.
  The Ninevites and their animals repent.

Yahweh repents.
  Jonah is angry; he prays reproachfully.

Yahweh questions; He appoints a plant.
  Jonah rejoices.

Yahweh appoints a worm.
  The plant dies.

---

[1] See Wolff, op. cit., col. 856; Östborn, Cult and Canon, p. 59; Weiser, ATD, p. 226.

Yahweh appoints an east wind.
   Jonah despairs and asks death.

Yahweh questions.
   Jonah answers.

Yahweh questions.

5) Animals play an important role in the story. We have observed elsewhere the amusing folk-tale motifs in which animals clothe themselves in sackcloth and ashes and repent. Beyond this we have seen how animals function as obedient servants of Yahweh. He uses them to carry out His purposes. There is still more: Yahweh shows a very special concern for animals. He places them on a par with children who do not know right from left (4:11). Their presence in Nineveh evokes his compassion upon the city. His very last words are "much cattle". We have material here for a theology of animals. This motif might be studied alongside such passages as the creation accounts (Gen. 1-2) and the flood stories (Gen. 6-9).[1]

C. The Heart of the Midrash

The many motifs in *Jonah* may be likened to the sparkles of a diamond. The diamond itself is the cultic confession in 4:2. Here is the heart of the midrash: the proclamation that God is love.[2] G. E. Wright notes that this confession in its various forms is the nearest the OT comes to presenting "an abstract presentation of the nature of God."[3] It is a recital of His "attributes"[4] rather than of His acts. We have already observed affinities between it and the wisdom literature.

---

[1] Cf. Vriezen, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-224.

[2] See Loretz, *op. cit.*, p. 25.   [3] Wright, *God Who Acts*, p. 85.

[4] The epithets *rahum wehannum* have been compared to the description of El in the Ugaritic texts as *lṭpn* and *d pʿed* (see, e.g., "The Epic of Baal" in G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, p. 112, lines 4, 10, 14). See Thomas, *Documents from OT Times*, p. 130, line 35, and p. 132, n. 19; Pope, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, p. 25.

A study of the history of this confession discloses several versions.[1] In what is perhaps the oldest statement (Ex. 34:6ff) stress is laid not only upon the love of Yahweh but also upon his visitation of the iniquity of the fathers upon the children (cf. Num. 14:18; Ex. 20:5f; Jer. 32:18). Here the solidarity of sin is affirmed. The Deuteronomic adaptation[2] of this formula modifies the emphasis upon the solidarity of generations with a distinction between those who love God and those who hate him. The former group receives the love of God; the latter knows his hate (Dt. 5:9f; 7:9f). The choice between love and hate is offered anew to every generation (cf. Dt. 5:3). The post-exilic version reveals yet another change: there are no references to the iniquities of the fathers or to the curses of God. These statements proclaim solely the love of God (cf. Neh. 1:5; Dan. 9:4; I Kgs. 8:23=II Chron. 6:14).

To this third version of the confession Jon. 4:2 belongs. It affirms the love of God for everyone without reservation.[3] This very affirmation negates any policy of exclusivism or nationalism. God's grace toward his creation is certain, for God is love. To know this love man need only to desist from his evil. It is this message which the author of Jonah teaches. He presents it in the form of a midrashic legend. The meaning of this ancient recital of divine "attributes" is communicated then in the telling of a fanciful story.[4]

---

[1] See Scharbert, op. cit., pp. 137-149; Loretz, op. cit., pp. 26-28.

[2] But see Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f," VT XIII (Jan. 1963), esp. 48. Dentan holds that the credo is not Deuteronomic in either style or vocabulary.

[3] Loretz, op. cit., p. 27.

[4] Cf. Wright, God Who Acts, p. 85: "To confess God is to tell a story

In this midrash God's love embraces the world. It is manifested toward heathen sailors, the citizens of Nineveh, and even dumb animals. Thereby our author makes explicit that which is implicit in the credo of 4:2: by its very nature the love of God is all-inclusive. He articulates this universalism in clear and unmistakable ways. To affirm that God is love is to affirm the universality of His love and the resultant missionary outreach of His purpose.[1] This fact hardly requires additional comment. What needs treatment, however, is the relationship of divine love to the prophet Jonah. This facet of the story is frequently overlooked by commentators.

Throughout Jonah is a foil to love. He sets his word (4:2a) against the word of God. He is angry; Yahweh is "slow to anger". He does not repent of evil; Yahweh does.[2] In short, Jonah is unloving; Yahweh is love. The prophet does not reflect the image of his God, even though he knows about this image and gives intellectual assent to it. Accordingly, he is a bundle of contradictions. Von Rad calls him a "monster" and contrasts his complexity with the simplicity of the other characters in the story.[3] The two confessions (1:9; 4:2) bring out this trait most effectively. Jonah can recite to perfection the ancient credos. He has memorized them well, but he does not really know them. He can say that Yahweh is "God of

---

and then to expound its meaning."

[1] But cf. the most unusual thesis of B. Dinur that the book of *Jonah* is answered by the author of Psalm 139, whose protest against the wicked (vs 19-24) refers to "those Jews who believe the mission of Israel to be spreading the knowledge of God among the peoples, which actually is only *verbal recognition* of its truth." ("The Historical Significance of Psalm 139," *Yitzhak F. Baer Jubilee Volume*; Hebrew article on pp. 8-27; English summary on p. VIIf.)

[2] Goitein, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

[3] von Rad, "Jona", p. 11; cf. *Theologie* II, p. 303.

the Heavens who made the sea and the dry land", while at that very time he is determined to flee from the divine presence. What his words affirm his existence denies.[1] So it is when he prays to Yahweh in 4:2. His "confession" of the divine love sounds more like a curse or a condemnation.[2] Love is unacceptable to egocentric man. Thus from the standpoint of his own existence Jonah does not speak the truth. Instead he uses or manipulates words of truth to express his own arrogance and self-centeredness. Yet, mirabile dictu, the wrath of Jonah praises Yahweh (cf. Ps. 76:10), for the divine will is accomplished through an unwilling prophet.

In Chapter 1 Jonah tries to deny or ignore the love of God through escape. First, he boards a ship for Tarshish, but Yahweh confronts him with a great wind. Jonah responds by retreating to the "innermost recesses of the ship" and by sleeping (1:5). Again Yahweh confronts him through the captain of the ship who demands that Jonah pray to his god and through the casting of lots which results in his having to confess. Next the prophet attempts a most drastic form of escape: drowning. Surely in death there is an outlet from the love of God. But the sea does not fulfill this selfish wish, for it too is a creature of Yahweh. It contains the divinely appointed fish which swallows the prophet and later ejects him onto the dry land of which Yahweh is also Lord. Thus ends the first section of the narrative. Our author teaches that there is no escape from the divine love. To ignore it is to acknowledge it; to flee from it is to encounter it.

The second section opens with Jonah going to Nineveh as commanded by God (Chapter 3:1ff). It is a mistake to think that the prophet is now in harmony with divine love. At best his acceptance is a "giving in", a resignation to God. At worst it is another way of fighting: to oppose through external obedience. It is to say yes and to mean no. Again the prophet sets his will against the will of God. He preaches to Nineveh and then withdraws to await the outcome (4:5). The salvation of Nineveh is no surprise to Jonah; he expected it because he "knows" that God is love and repents of evil. So he does not attempt to argue that this city should not be saved. Instead he uses this occasion as an opportunity for confirming and justifying his own behavior and attitude. "Was not this my word when I was in my own country" is but an arrogant boast. In effect Jonah says, "I have a right to be angry because I know that you are a God of love. In your salvation of Nineveh I have proved my point." Here egocentrism identifies itself as the opposite of love and seeks its justification by berating divine love.

---

[1] Haller, op. cit., p. 21f.

[2] von Rad, op. cit., p. 7. Cf. Dentan, op. cit., p. 39: Jonah is "reproaching God for being what every worshiper knew He was."

What follows is of prime importance, for we see the love of God extended to his defiant prophet. Yahweh does not hate the one who hates Him; He does not visit iniquity upon Jonah. Instead he offers salvation to his prophet, even as he had offered it to the city of Nineveh. The question, "Dost thou well to be angry?" is an invitation to consider the folly of anger.[1] The purpose of the plant is "to save Jonah from evil" (4:6) much as the prophetic oracle had been designed to save Nineveh from its evil. The plant does elicit a joyful response from Jonah, and the implication is that the prophet is momentarily lifted out of himself. His anger dissipates in joy over the plant. Yet the joy is short-lived, for the plant dies (4:7). Robbed of his comfort, Jonah is angry and reiterates his wish to die. This wish is the ultimate form of egocentrism. Through self-negation Jonah seeks self-confirmation. But the love of God does not permit the prophet so to destroy himself. Yahweh continues to break through the self-centeredness by focusing upon divine compassion.

---

[1] See S. H. Blank ("Dost Thou Well to Be Angry?" HUCA XXVI, 1955, 29-41), who finds here the theme of "human self-pity matched by divine suffering."

The final sentence contrasts Jonah and Yahweh. This time the contrast is not between opposites but between degrees of love. There is similarity between Yahweh and Jonah. In his rejoicing over the plant Jonah had shown and known compassion in his own existence. It was not just a verbal expression of love; it was a realizing of it, a genuine awareness of it, even though the experience was brief and limited. Using this sign of compassion as a point of contact, Yahweh hopes to lead the prophet to a true cognition of His own love. The argument is *a minori ad majus*.[1] It is worked out by a double contrast: Jonah and the plant; Yahweh and Nineveh. We note first the contrast between the *qiqayon* and Nineveh:[2]

Plant	Nineveh
grew up in one night	an ancient city
an ephemeral creation whose withering is of little consequence	a great city whose destruction would be catastrophic
not the work of Jonah	the work of Yahweh

If Jonah can show pity on this plant, then how much more God should show pity on Nineveh. In the light of the prophet's own small concern it is possible for him to begin to comprehend the magnitude and depth of Yahweh's concern. Thus Yahweh instructs His own messenger in the meaning of his own message to Nineveh. The compassionate God teaches of His love.[1]

---

[1] See Blank, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30; Weiser, ATD, p. 225f; Robinson, HAT, p. 125f; Rinaldi, *op. cit.*, p. 213.

Dale, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

This final sentence is not a statement but a question. No answer is recorded for Jonah, and the reason is obvious. All who hear the story are to see themselves in Jonah. They are called upon to examine their own understanding of the love of God and to consider in particular the universal out reach of that love. In Jonah their own egocentrism is exposed; their idle words of confession are confronted by the reality of the Word of God. That Word is Love. To it each listener must reply. To flee from it is to encounter it; to ignore it is to acknowledge it; to fight it is to exalt it; to damn it is to praise it. But to understand it is to embrace it. Yahweh's dealings with Nineveh and with Jonah make this last a possibility for all. Through His question the loving God seeks a loving response.

---

[1] For an illuminating comparison of the message of Jonah with the parable of the Prodigal Son, see J. Alonso Díaz, "Paralelas entre la Narración del Libro de Jonás y la Parábola del Hijo Pródigo," Biblica 40 (1959), 632-40. In both stories God is the loving father who forgives. Nineveh is like the Prodigal Son who repents; Jonah is like the elder son who resents the love of the Father.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Texts, Dictionaries, and Source Materials

Andrews, E.A., ed. *Harpers' Latin Dictionary*. Revised and enlarged by C. T. Lewis and C. Short. New York: American Book Company, c 1907.

The Apocrypha. Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1957.

Apollodori. *Bibliothèque d'Appllodore*, II. Translated by E. Clavier, Paris: Delance et Lesueur, 1805.

Bachmann, Johannes. "Jona und Haggai." *Präparationen zu den Kleinen Propheten*, Vol. 5. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1891.

Baer, S. *Liber Duodecim Prophetarum. Textum Masoreticum Accuratissime Expressit*. Leipzig, 1878.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. 4th edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Benoît, P., Milik, J. T., and Vaux, R. de. *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, II. *Les Grottes de Murabbaʿât*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

Berosi. *Chaldaeorum Historiae*. Leipzig: C. H. F. Hartmanni, 1925.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Hebräische Syntax*. Kreis Moers, 1956.

__________. *Lexicon Syriacum*. 2nd edition. Halis Saxonum: Sumptibus Max Niemeyer, 1928.

Brooke, A. E., McLean, N., and Thackeray, H. St. J., eds. *The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1927.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, C.A. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

Churgin, P., ed. *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

Cicero. *De naturum deorum*. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1933.

Cowell, E. B., ed. *The Jātaka*, IV. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. Cambridge: The University Press, 1901.

Cowley, A. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

Danby, Herbert, ed. The Mishnah. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.

Diodorus Siculus, II. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1935.

Driver, G. R. "Baal," Canaanite Myths and Legends, Old Testament Studies III. Edinburgh: T.and T. Clark, 1956. Pp. 72-120.

Driver, S. R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. 3rd edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1892.

Field, Fred, ed. Origenis Hexaplorum quae Supersunt. 2 vols. Oxford: 1867, 1875.

Gaster, T. H. The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation. Garden City: Doubleday & Co., 1956.

Geden, Alfred S. and Kilgour, R. Introduction to the Ginsburg Edition of the Hebrew Old Testament. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1928.

Gesenius' Hebrew Grammer, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. 2nd English ed. by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1960.

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Legend of King Keret." BASOR, Supplementary Studies Nos. 2-3. New Haven,Conn.: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1946.

Ginsburg, C. D. The Massorah compiled from Manuscripts. 4 vols. London: privately printed, 1880-1905.

Glatzer, Nahum N. Hammer on the Rock. A Short Midrash Reader. New York: Schocken Books, 1962.

Gordon, C. H. Ugaritic Manual. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1955.

Graetz, H. Emendationes, II. Leipzig: E. F. Steinacker, 1893.

Grangaard, P. H. Versuch einer metrischen Uebersetzung des Propheten Jona. Flensburg and Leipzig: Kortenschen Buchhandlung, 1792.

Grimm, H. A., ed. "Jonae et Obadiae oracula Syriace." Duisburgi: Apud Baedeker et Kürzel, 1805.

Harris, Zellig S. A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1936.

Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A. A Concordance to the Septuagint. 3 vols. Akademische Druck U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Holmes, Robert and Parsons, James. Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus. 5 vols. Oxford, 1798-1827.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946 and 1952.

Jerome. *Sur Jonas.* Introduction and notes by Dom Paul Antin. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1956.

Josephus. *The Jewish Wars.* The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann,Ltd., 1927.

Kautzsch, E. *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament.* Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1902.

Kennicott, B. *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus.* 2 vols. Oxford, 1776-80.

Kittel, Rudolf, ed. *Biblia Hebraica.* 3rd edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1954.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

__________. *Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Lagarde, Paulus de, ed., *Prophetae Chaldaice.* Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1872.

Lee, Samuel, ed. *Vetus Testamentum Syriace.* London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1823.

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., and Jones, H. S. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1948.

Lycophron. *Alexandra.* The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1921.

Machen, J. Gresham. *New Testament Greek for Beginners.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956.

Mandelkern, S. *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae.* 2 vols. Tel-Aviv: Schoken Publishing House, Ltd., 1959.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series latina. 221 vols., including 4 vols. of indexes. Paris, 1844-55.

Mikraoth Gedoloth. Warsaw: N. Shriftgisera, 1874-77.

Oesterley, W. O. E. "The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets," JTS V (1904-05), 76-79; 378-381.

Ovid. *Metamorphosis*, II. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1916.

The Pahchatantra. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1915.

Pliny. *Natural History*, II. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1942.

Pritchard, James, ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. 2nd edition. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955.

Procksch, O., ed. "Liber XII Prophetarum," *Biblia Hebraica*, ed. by R. Kittel. 3rd edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1954.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta id est Vetus Testamentus Graece juxta LXX Interpretes*. 2 vols. 6th edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Wurtt. Bibelanstalt, 1959.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, c 1934.

Rossi, J. B. de. *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti*. 4 vols. Parma, 1784-8.

Sanders, Henry A. and Schmidt, Carl. *The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Schnabel, Paul. *Berossos und die Babylonisch-Hellenistische Literatur*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1923.

Sebök, Mark. *Die syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinem Propheten*. Breslau: Preuss and Jünger, 1887.

Siegfried, Carl and Stade, Bernhard. *Hebräisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testamente*. Leipzig: Veit and Comp., 1893.

Snaith, Norman H. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of Jonah*. London: The Epworth Press, 1945.

Sperber, Alexander, ed. *The Bible in Aramaic*, III. Leiden: E. J. Brill,1962.

Strabo. *The Geography of Strabo*. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1930.

Strack, Hermann L., ed. *Prophetarum posteriorum*. *Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus* auspiciis Augustissimi Imperatoris Alexandri II. Editio Bibliothecae publicae imperialis. Petropoli, 1876.

Sukenik, E. L., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1955.

Thomas, D. Winton, ed. *Documents from OT Times*. London: Thos. Nelson, 1958.

Vulgatae Editionis. *Biblia Sacra*. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, n.d.

Wright, G. E. and Filson, F. V., eds. *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, c 1945.

Wright, W. *The Book of Jonah in Four Semitic Versions*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1857.

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. *Septuaginta*, XIII. *Duodecim prophetae*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1943.

B.. Books and Commentaries

Albright, W. F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. 2nd edition. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc. 1957.

Andersen, H. *Andersen's Fairy Tales*. Translated by Mrs. E. Lucas and Mrs. H. B. Paull. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, n.d.

Anderson, George W. *A Critical Introduction to the OT*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., c 1959.

Baab, Otto J. *The Theology of the Old Testament*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1949.

Balscheit, Bruno. *Des Gottesbrund*: *Einführung in das Alte Testament*. Zurich: Zwingli, n.d.

Baly, Denis. *The Geography of the Bible*. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, c 1957.

Baron, Solo W., and Blau, Joseph L., ed. *Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period*. The Library of Religion. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, c 1954.

Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford University Press, 1961.

Baudissin, W. W. *Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1901.

Ben-Chorin, Schalom. *Die Antwort des Jona zum Gestaltwandel Israels*. Hamburg-Volksdorf: Herbert Reich Verlag GmbH., 1956.

Bentzen, A. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. 2 vols. 4th edition. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1958.

Bertholdt, Leonhard. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sämmtliche kanonische und apokrnphische Schriften des alten und neuen Testaments*, Vol. 5. Johann Jacob Palm, 1815.

Bewer, Julius A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jonah*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951.

Bird, T. E. *The Book of Jona*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1938.

Birkeland, Harris. *Zum Hebräischen Traditionswesen*. Oslo: Kommisjon hos Jacob Dybwad, 1938.

Bleek, Friedrich. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, II, edited by Johannes Bleek and Adolf Kamphausen. Translated by G. H. Venables. London: Bell and Daldy, 1869.

Bleeker, L. H. K. *De Kleine Profeten*, II. Tekst En Uitleg. Groningen: J. B . Wolters, 1934.

Bloch, J. S. *Studiem zur Geschichte der Sammlung der althebräische Literatur*. Leipzig, 1875.

Blunt, A. W. F. *The Prophets of Israel*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1929.

Bodenheimer, F. S. *Animal and Man in Bible Lands*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

Buber, Martin. *Moses*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

__________. *The Prophetic Faith*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Budde, Karl. *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur*. Leipzig: C. F. Amelang, 1906.

Bulfinch, Thomas. *The Age of Fable*. Boston: Charles E. Brown & Co., n.d.

Burrows, Millar. *An Outline of Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c 1946.

__________. *What Mean These Stones?* New York: Living Age Books, 1957.

Chary, Th. *Les Prophètes et le Culte*. Tournai: Desclée & Co., c 1955.

Cohen, A., ed. *The Twelve Prophets*. Bournemouth, Hants: The Soncino Press, 1948.

Collodi, E. *Pinocchio. The Tale of a Puppet*. Translated by M. A. Murray. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1956.

Cook, S. A. *The Old Testament: a Reinterpretation*. London: Cambridge, 1936.

Cornill, Carl H. *Einleitung in die kanonische Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1905.

__________. *Introduction to the canonical Books of the Old Testament*. Translated by G. H. Box. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1907.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City: N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.

Deere, Derward W. *The Twelve Speak*, I. New York: The American Press, 1958.

Delcor, M. "Jonas," Les Petits Prophètes, *La Sainte Bible*, by A. Deissler and M. Delcor. Vol. VIII (1st part). Paris: Letouzey and Ané, 1966.

Delitzsch, Friedrich. *Babel and Bible*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.

Dennefeld, L. *Introduction a L'Ancien Testament*. Baris: Librairie Bloud et Gay, 1934.

De Haan, M. R. *Jonah: Fact or Fiction?* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957.

De Wette, W. M. L. *Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*. Translated by Theodore Parker. Boston: Charles C. Little and James Brown, 1843.

Dodson, T. H. *The Book of Jonah*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1916.

Döller, Johannes. *Das Buch Jona*. Wien und Leipzig: Kaiserliche und königliche Hog-Buchdruckerei und Hof-Verlags-Buchhandlung Carl Fromme, 1912.

Driver, S. R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the OT*. New York: The Meridian Library, 1956.

Dummelow, J. R., ed. *A Commentary on the Holy Bible*. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950.

Edgar, S. L. *The Minor Prophets*. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.

Eerdmans, B. D. *The Religion of Israel*. Leiden: Universitaire pers Leiden, 1947.

Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*, V: *Ezechiel und die Kleinen Propheten*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1912.

Eichrodt, W. *Theology of the Old Testament*, I. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

Eiselen, Frederick Carl. *The Prophetic Books of the OT*, II. New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1923.

Eissfeldt, Otto. *Einleitung in das AT*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934; 2nd edition, 1956.

Erbt, Wilhelm. *Elia, Elisa, Jona*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1907.

Evans, D. Tecwyn. *The Book of Jonah*. London: James Clarke & Co., Limited, 1925.

Ewald, G. H. A. von. *Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament*, V. Translated by J. Frederick Smith. London: Williams and Norgate, 1881.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Die Jüngsten Propheten des Alten Bundes*. 2nd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1868.

Farrar, F. W. *The Minor Prophets*. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph and Company, n.d.

Feuillet, A., "Le Livre de Jonas." *La Sainte Bible*. 2nd edition. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1957.

Frazer, Sir James George. *Folk-lore in the Old Testament*, III. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited, 1918.

Friedrichsen, P. *Kritische Uebersicht der verschiedenen Ansichten von dem Buche Jonas*. Leipzig: Friedr. Christ. Wilh. Vogel, 1841.

Frobenius, Leo. *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes*. Berlin: Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer, 1904.

Gaster, T. H. *Festivals of the Jewish Year*. New York: William Sloane Associates, c 1953.

Ginsburg, Christian D. *Introduction to the Masoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible*. London: The Trinitarian Bible Society, 1897.

Goldhorn, J. D. *Exkurse zum Buche Jonas*. Leipzig, 1803.

Goldziher, Ignaz. *Mythology among the Hebrews and Its Historical Development*. Translated by Russell Martineau. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1877.

Gordon, Alex. R. *The Prophets of the Old Testament*. New York: George H. Doran Company, n.d.

Gordon, Cyrus H. *The World of the Old Testament*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.

Gottwald, Norman K. *A Light to the Nations*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Gray, George Buchanan. *A Critical Introduction to the OT*. London: 1913.

Grimm, The Brothers. *Grimm's Fairy Tales*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1945.

__________. *Grimm's Fairy Tales*. New York: The F. M. Lupton Publishing Company, n.d.

__________. *Grimm's Popular Tales*. New York: A. L. Burt Company, n.d.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Einleitung in die Psalmen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1933.

__________. *Genesis*. 3rd edition. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.

__________. *The Legends of Genesis*. Translated by W. H. Carruth. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1901.

__________. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.

__________. *What Remains of the Old Testament and Other Essays*. Translated by Rev. A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

Hahn, Herbert F. *Old Testament in Modern Research*. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c 1954.

Halévy, J. *Recherches Bibliques*, IV. Paris, 1907.

Hanson, Anthony. *Jonah and Daniel*. The Christian Students' Library No. 9. Madras: The Christian Literature Society, 1955.

Harden, Donald. *The Phoenicians*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1962.

Hardt, Hermann von der. *AEnigmata Prisci Orbis*. Helmstadii: Salomonis Schnorrii, 1723.

Hengstenberg, E. W. *Christology of the Old Testament*, I. 2nd edition, translated by Theodore Meyer. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871.

Henshaw, T. *The Latter Prophets*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., c 1958.

Hitzig, Ferdinand. *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*. 2nd edition. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1863.

Hölscher, Gustav. *Die Profeten*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914.

Hoenig, S. B. and Rosenberg, S. *A Guide to the Prophets*. New York: Bloch Publishing Co., 1942.

Hoonacker, A. van. *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1908.

Horton, R. F. *The Minor Prophets*. The Century Bible. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack, n.d.

Htin Aung, Maung. *Burmese Folk-Tales*. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege, 1954.

Humbert, Paul. *Problèmes du livre d'Habacuc*. Neuchatel: Secrétariat de l'Université, 1944.

Hylmö, G. *Gamla Testamentets Litteraturhistoria*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1938.

Jensen, P. C. A. *Das Gilgamesch-epos in der Weltliteratur*. Strassburg: K. J. Trubner, 1906.

Jeremias, Alfred. *Handbuch des altorientalischen Geisteskultur*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1929.

__________. *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East.* 2 vols. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.

Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu.* 2 vols. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899.

Kalisch, M. M. *The Book of Jonah,* preceded by a treatise on "The Hebrew and the Stranger". Bible Studies, Part II. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *The Religion of Israel.* Translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Kautzsch, E. and Bertholet, A. "Der Prophet Jona," *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments,* II, edited by Kautzsch and Bertholet. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923, pp. 49-53.

Keil, C. F. *The Twelve Minor Prophets.* Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, I. Translated by James Martin. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.

Kennedy, James. *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the OT.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928.

__________. *The Note-Line in the Hebrew Scriptures.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903.

Kennedy, James Hardee. *Studies in the book of Jonah.* Nashville, Tenn.: The Broadman Press, c 1956.

Kennedy, John. *On the Book of Jonah.* London: Alexander and Shepheard, 1895.

Kent, C. F. *The Growth and Contents of the OT.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925.

Kleinert, Paul. "The Book of Jonah," translated and enlarged by Charles Elliott in John Peter Lange, *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: The Minor Prophets,* edited by Philip Schaff. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, and Company, 1875.

Knight, George A. F. *Ruth and Jonah.* Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press, 1950.

Knopf, Carl Sumner. *The Old Testament Speaks.* New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946.

Köhler, L. *Hebrew Man.* New York: Abingdon Press, 1956.

__________. *Old Testament Theology.* Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, c 1957.

König, Ed. *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik.* Leipzig: Theodor Weicher, 1900.

Kraeling, Emil G. *Bible Atlas*. New York: Rand McNally and Company, 1956.

Kuenen, A. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des Alten Testaments*, II. Translated by C. Th. Müller. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1892.

Kuhl, Curt. *The Old Testament: Its Origins and Composition*. Translated by C. T. M. Herriott. Oliver and Boyd: Edinburgh, 1961.

_________. *The Prophets of Israel*. Translated by Rudolf J. Ehrlich & J. P. Smith. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960.

Lanchester, H. C. O. *Obadiah and Jonah*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1918.

Lenormant, Francois. *Essai de Commentaire des Fragments Cosmogoniques de Berose*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Co., 1871.

Lippl, Joseph and Theis, Johannes. *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, I. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1937.

Lods, Adolphe. *The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism*. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1950.

MacDonald, D. B. *The Hebrew Literary Genius*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1933.

Marti, K. *Das Dodekapropheton*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904.

Martin, Hugh. *The Prophet Jonah*. 3rd edition. Edinburgh: James Gemmell, 1889.

Martin-Achard, R. *Israël et les nations*. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, c 1959.

Mazar, B., ed. *Views of the Biblical World*. 5 vols. Jerusalem: International Publishing Company, 1960.

Meek, T. J. *Hebrew Origins*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Mendelsohn, I., ed. *Religions of the Ancient Near East*. The Library of Religion. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, c 1955.

Mitchell, Stuart. *Jonah*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1875.

Moldenke, H. N. and A. L. *Plants of the Bible*. Waltham, Mass.: Chronica Botanica Co., 1952.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings*, edited by Henry S. Gehman. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1951.

Moore, G. F. *The Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: H. Holt and Company, c 1913.

Moscati, Sabatino. *Ancient Semitic Civilizations*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960.

__________. *The Face of the Ancient Orient*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.

Mowinckel, S. *He That Cometh*. Translated by G. W. Anderson. New York: Abingdon Press, n.d.

__________. *Psalmenstudien* III. Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1923.

Mowinckel, S. and Messel, N. *De Senere Profeter*. *Det Gamle Testament*, Vol. 3. Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co., 1944.

Muller, J. G. A. "Jona, eine moralische Erzählung" in Paulus' *Memorabilien*, VI, p. 142ff. Leipzig: ben Siegfr. Lebrecht Cruisius, 1794.

Muilenburg, J. *The Way of Israel*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

Myers, Jacob M. "The Book of Jonah," *The Layman's Bible Commentary*, 14. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, c 1959.

Nachtigal, J. C. C. "Über das Buch des Alten Testaments mit der Aufschrift: Jonas," *Allegemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*, IX, edited by J. G. Eichhorn. Leipzig: Weidmannschen Buchhandlung, 1799. Pp. 221-273.

Newcome, William. *An Attempt towards an Improved Version, a Metrical Arrangement, and an Explanation of the Twelve Minor Prophets*. London, 1785.

Nötscher, Friedrich. *Zwölfprophetenbuch oder Kleine Propheten*. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1948.

Noth, Martin. *Exodus*. Translated by J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1962.

__________. *The History of Israel*. Translated by Stanley Godman. New York: Harper and Brothers, c 1958.

Nowack, W. *Die Kleinen Propheten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1903.

Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, T. H. *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960.

Olmstead, A. T. *History of Assyria*. Chicago: The University Press, 1960.

Orelli, C. von. *The Twelve Minor Prophets*. Translated by J. S. Banks. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1893.

Paterson, John. *The Goodly Fellowship of the Prophets*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.

Pedersen, J. *Israel, Its Life and Culture.* London: Oxford University Press, 1926 (vol. I-II), 1940 (vol. III-IV).

Perowne, T. T. *Jonah.* The Cambridge Bible for Schools. Cambridge: The University Press, 1879.

Pfeiffer, Robert. *Introduction to the Old Testament.* 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Pidge, John B. Gough. *Jonah.* An American Commentary on the Old Testament: Minor Prophets, Vol. I. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication, 1935.

Pope, Marvin H. *El in the Ugaritic Texts.* VT Supplement II. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955.

Pritchard, J. B. *Archaeology and the OT.* Princeton: University Press, 1958.

Procksch, D. O. *Die kleinen Prophetischen Schriften nach dem Exil.* Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1916.

Pusey, E. B. *The Minor Prophets,* I. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1885.

Rad, G. von. *Genesis.* Translated by John H. Marks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.

_________. *Old Testament Theology,* I. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1962.

_________. *Theologie des Alten Testaments,* II. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1960.

Rankin, O. S. *Israel's Wisdom Liberature.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.

Reymond, Philippe. *L'Eau, sa Vie, et sa Signification dans L'Ancien Testament.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Reissler, Paul. *Die kleinen Propheten.* Rottenburg: Wilhelm Bader, 1911.

Robert, A. and Tricot, A. *Guide to the Bible,* I. Translated by Edward P. Arbez and Martin R. P. McGuire. New York: Desclee Company, 1960.

Roberts, Bleddyn J. *The OT Text and Versions.* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1951.

Robinson, H. Wheeler. *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1962.

Robinson, Theodore H. "Jona," *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten,* HAT. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1954.

_________. *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel.* London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1953.

Rosenmüller, E. F. C. Scholia in Vetus Testamentum. Partis Septimae, Prophetas Minores Continentis. Lipsiae: Joh. Ambros. Barthii, 1827.

Rowley, H. H. The Growth of the OT. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1950.

_________. The Missionary Message of the Old Testament. London: The Carey Press, n.d.

Rudolph, William. Chronikbücher, HAT 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1955.

Rylaarsdam, C. Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature. Chicago: The University Press, 1946.

Sayce, A. H. The "Higher Criticism" and the Verdict of the Monuments. 2nd edition. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1894.

_________. Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as illustrated by the religion of the Ancient Babylonians. 4th edition. London: Williams and Norgate, 1897.

Sellin, E. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 9th edition ed. by L. Rost. Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1959.

_________. Introduction to the OT. 3rd edition. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Shutter, Marion D. Wit and Humor of the Bible. Boston: Arena Publishing Company, 1893.

Simons, J. The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Simpson, William. The Jonah Legend. London: Grant Richards, 1899.

Smith, George Adam. The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Doran and Co., Inc., 1929.

Steiner, Heinrich and Hitzig, F. Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. 4th edition. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1881.

Steinmann, Jean. Le Livre de Consolation d'Israël et les Prophètes du Retour de l'Exil. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1960.

Steuernagel, Carl. Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912.

Strack, Hermann L. Einleitung in das Alte Testament. München: C. H. Beck, 1906.

_________. Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York: Meridian Books, 1959.

Tobac, Édouard. *Les Prophètes d'Israël*, II-III. Malines: H. Dessain, 1921.

Torrey, Charles C. *The Apocryphal Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.

Trent, Kenneth E. *Types of Christ in the Old Testament*. New York: Exposition Press, 1960.

Tylor, E. B. *Primitive Culture*. 2 vols. in 1. New York: Bretano's, 1924.

Ungern-Sternberg, Rolf Freiherr von. "Der Prophet Jona." *Der Tag des Gerichtes Gottes* by Ungern-Sternberg and Helmut Lamparter. Die Botschaft des Alten Testaments, 23/IV. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.

Vatke, Wilhelm. *Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Bonn: Verlag von Emil Strauss, 1886.

Vaux, R. de. *Ancient Israel*. Translated by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Voeltzel, René. *Das Lachen des Herrn*. Hamburg: Herbert Reich Evangelischer, 1961.

Vriezen, Th. C. *An Outline of Old Testament Theology*. Newton, Mass.: Charles T. Branford, 1960.

Wade, G. W. *The Books of the Prophets Micah, Obadiah, Joel and Jonah*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1925.

Weiser, Artur. *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, I. ATD, 3rd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1959.

__________. *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957.

__________. *The Old Testament: Its Formation and Development*. Translated by D. M. Barton. New York: Association Press, 1961.

Wellhausen, J. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V. *Die Kleinen Propheten*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1892.

Westermann, Claus. *Grundformen Prophetischer Rede*. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1960.

Wiedemann, Alfred. *Die Unterhaltungslitteratur der alten Agypter*. Der alte Orient. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1903.

Wiseman, D. J. *Illustrations from Biblical Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958.

Wright, Charles H. H. *An Introduction to the OT*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.

Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the OT*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.

Young, Edward J. *An Introduction to the Old Testament*. London: The Tyndale Press, 1949.

C. Articles and Periodicals

Albright, W. F. "New Light on the Early History of Phoenician Colonization," BASOR 83 (Oct. 1941), 14-22.

__________. "Some Canaanite-Phoenician sources of Hebrew wisdom," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. Supplement to VT, III. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955, Pp. 1-15.

Alonso Díaz, José. "Paralelos entre la Narración del Libro de Jonás y la Parábola del Hijo Pródigo," *Biblica* 40 (1959), 632-640.

Ball, C. J. "Babylonian Hieroglyphs," PSBA 20 (1898), 9-20.

Barthélemy, D. "Redecouverte d'un chainon manguant de l'histoire de la Septante," RB 60 (1953), 18-29.

Baumgartner, W. "The Wisdom Literature," OTMS, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. 210-237.

Baur, F. C. "Der Prophet Jonas, ein assyrisch-babylonisch Symbol," Illgen's *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, VII. Leipzig, 1837. Pp. 88-114.

Bergstrasser, G. "Das hebräische Präfix ש -" ZAW 29 (1909), 40-56.

Blank, Sheldon H. "'Doest Thou Well to be Angry?' A Study in Self-Pity," HUCA XXVI (1955), 29-41.

__________. "Wisdom," IDB 4. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 852-861.

Bloch, Renée. "Midrash," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Supplement 5. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1957. Cols. 1263-1281.

Böhme, W. "Die Composition des Buches Jona," ZAW 7 (1887), 224-284.

Boman, Th. "Jahve og Elohim: Jonaboken," NTT 37 (1936), 159-168.

Briggs, C. A. "Works of the Imagination in the Old Testament," *The North American Review*, 164 (March, 1897), 356-373.

Brockington, L. H. "Jonah," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962. Pp. 627-620.

Budde, Karl. "Book of Jonah," JE, VII. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1804. Pp. 227-230.

__________. "Vermutungen zum 'Midrasch des Buches der Könige'," ZAW 12 (1892), 37-51.

Büchler, Adolf. "Hafṭarah," JE VI. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1804. Pp. 135-36.

Burkitt, F. C. "The Prophets of Israel," *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, edited by Charles Gore, H. L. Goudge, A. Guillaume. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929. Pp. 419-432.

Campbell, Joseph. "Folkloristic Commentary," *Grimm's Fairy Tales*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1945. Pp. 833-864.

Cheyne, T. K. "Jonah," EB II, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. Sutherland Black. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1901. Cols. 2565-2571.

__________. "Jonah: A Study in Jewish Folklore and Religion," TR 57 (1877), 211-219.

Childs, Brevard S. "Jonah: A Study in Old Testament Hermenutics," SJT 11 (1958), 53-61.

Cooke, G. A. "Jonah," *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, edited by Charles Gore, H. L. Goudge, A. Guillaume. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929. Pp. 580-583.

Dahood, Mitchell J. "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth," *Biblica* 33 (1952), 30-52.

Dale, R. W. "Jonah," *The Expositor*, Fourth Series, VI. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892. Pp. 1-18.

Delcor, M. "Manières d' Écrire le Tétragramme Sacré," RHR 147 (1955), 145-173.

Dentan, R. C. "The Literary Affinities of Exodus xxxiv 6f," VT XIII (Jan. 1963), 34-51.

Dijkema, F. "Het boek Jona," NTT 25 (1936), 338-347.

Dinur, B. "The Historical Significance of Psalm 139," *Yitzhak F. Baer Jubilee Volume*. Jerusalem: The Historical Society of Israel, 1960. Hebrew article, pp. 8-27; English summary, p. viif.

Dobsevage, ~~I.~~ George. "Hafṭarah," JE VI. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1804. Pp. 136-37.

Driver, G. R. "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," *Studies in OT Prophecy*, edited by H. H. Rowley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. Pp. 52-72.

__________. "Hebrew Notes on Prophets and Proverbs," JTS 41 (1940), 162-175.

Eissfeldt, O. "The Prophetic Literature," OTMS, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. 119-126.

Ellul, J. "Le Livre de Jonas," *Foi et Vie* 50 (1952), 81-184.

Ermoni, V. "Jonas," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Vol. 3, Part 2, edited by F. Vigouroux. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1926. Cols. 1605-1613.

Feuillet, A. "Jonas," *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, Vol. 4, edited by L. Pirot and A. Robert. Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1949. Cols. 1104-1131.

__________. "Le Sens du Livre de Jonas," RB 54 (1947), 340-361.

__________. "Les Sources du Livre de Jonas," RB 54 (1947), 161-186.

Fohrer, Georg. "Neuere Literatur zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie," TR 19 (1951), 277-346; 20 (1952), 193-271.

Freedman, David Noel. "Note on Jonah 1:4b," JBL 77 (1958), 161-162.

Gehman, Henry S. "Ἅγιος in the Septuagint and its Relation to the Hebrew Original," VT IV (1954), 337-348.

Gerstenberger, Erhard. "The Woe-Oracles of the Prophets," JBL 81 (Sept. 1962), 249-263.

Goitein, S. D. F. "Some Observations on Jonah," JPOS 17 (1937), 63-77.

Goldman, M. D. "Was the Book of Jonah Originally Written in Aramaic?" Lexicographical Notes on Exegesis (4), *Australian Biblical Review*, Vol. III, Nos. 1-4 (March/December, 1953), 49-50.

Good, Edwin M. "Jots and Tittles and the Gospel," USQR XI, No. 1 (November, 1955), 39-44.

Gordon, C. H. "Tarshish" (3.), IDB 4. New York: Abingdon Press. Pp. 517-18.

Gross, E. "Midrasch," RGG 4.4th edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1960. Cols. 940-941.

Gunkel, H. "The Close of Micah: a Prophetic Liturgy," *What Remains of the OT and Other Essays*. Translated by Rev. A. K. Dallas. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.

__________. "Die Israelitische Literatur," Die orientalischen Literatur, I 7 of *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1906. Pp. 51-102.

__________. "Jonabuch," RGG III. 2nd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1929. Cols. 366-369.

__________. "Jonapsalm," RGG III. 2nd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1929. Cols. 369-370.

__________. "Sagen und Legenden II. In Israel." RGG V. 2nd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931. Cols. 49-60.

Hardy, E. "Jona c. 1 und Jat. 439," *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 50 (1896), 153.

Hart-Davies, D. E. "The Book of Jonah in the Light of Assyrian Archaeology," JTVI LXIX (1937), 230-249.

Hebert, A. G. "Parable," *A Theological Word Book of the Bible*, edited by Alan Richardson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Herbert, A. S. "Ruth," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962. Pp. 316-17.

Honeyman, A. M. "Semitic Epigraphy and Hebrew Philology," OTMS, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. 264-282.

Horovitz, S. "Midrash," JE VIII. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1804. Pp. 548-550.

Humbert, Paul. "Le probleme du livre de Nahoum," RHPR 12 (1932), 1-15.

Jeffery, A. "The Canon of the Old Testament," IB I. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1952. Pp. 32-45.

__________. "Text and Ancient Versions of the Old Testament," IB I. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1952. Pp. 46-83.

Johnson, A. R. "Jonah II.3-10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, edited by H. H. Rowley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. Pp. 82-102.

__________. "The Psalms," OTMS, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. 162-207.

Joüon, Paul. "Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu," *Biblica* 10 (1929), 417-420.

Kahle, Paul. "Prolegomena," III, *Biblia Hebraica*. 3rd edition. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1954.

Katz, P. "Septuagintal Studies in the Mid-century," *The Background of the NT and its Eschatology*, edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Pp. 176-208.

Keller, Carl A. "'Die Gefährdung der Ahnfrau', Ein Beitrag zur gattungs- und motivgeschichtlichen Erforschung alttestamentlicher Erzählungen," ZAW 66 (1954), 181-191.

Komlós, O. "Jonah Legends," *Etudes Orientales* a la Mémoire de Paul Hirschler, ed. by O. Komlós. Budapest, 1950. Pp. 41-61.

König, Ed. "Jonah," DB II, edited by J. Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903. Pp. 744-53.

Kohler, K. "The Original Form of the Book of Jonah," TR 16 (January, 1879), 139-144.

Kraeling, E. G. H. "The Origin and Real Name of Nimrod," AJSLL 38 (Oct. 1921 - July, 1922), 216-220.

Lamb, Francis J. "The Book of Jonah," BS 81 (April, 1924), 152-169.

Lambert, W. G. "A Catalogue of Texts and Authors," JCS XVI, No. 3 (1962), 59-77.

Lindblom, Joh. "Lot-casting in the OT," VT XII (April, 1962), 164-178.

__________. "Wisdom in the Old Testament Prophets," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, edited by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas. Supplement to VT, III. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955. Pp. 192-204.

Loewe, Raphael. "Jerome's Treatment of an Anthropopathism," VT 2 (1952), 261-272.

Lohfink, N. "Jona ging zur Stadt hinaus (Jon. 4,5)," BZ 5:2 (July, 1961), 185-203.

Loretz, O. "Herkunft und Sinn der Jona-Erzählung," BZ 5:1 (Jan. 1961), 18-29.

Macloskie, G. "How to Test the Story of Jonah," BS 72 (April, 1915), 334-338.

Mauchline, J. "I Kings," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, edited by M. Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962. Pp. 338-347.

Mowinckel, S. "Legend," IDB 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1963. Pp. 108-110.

Mozley, F. W. "Proof of the Historical Truth of the Book of Jonah," BS 81 (April, 1924), 170-200.

Muilenburg, J. "Introduction and Exegesis to Isaiah, Chs. 40-66," IB V. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 381-773.

__________. "Is There a Biblical Theology?" USQR 12 (May, 1957), 29-37.

__________. "The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle כי in the Old Testament," HUCA 32 (1961), 135-160.

__________. "Modern Issues in Biblical Studies: The Gains of Form Criticism in OT Studies," *The Expository Times* 71 (1959-60), 229=233.

__________. "Old Testament Prophecy," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962. Pp. 475-483.

__________. "A Study in Hebrew Rhetoric: Repetition and Style," *Congress Volume* I, Supplements to VT. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953. Pp. 97-111.

Murtonen, A. "The Fixation in Writing of Various Parts of the Pentateuch," VT III (1953), 46-53.

Napier, B. D. "Prophet," IDB 3. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 896-919.

Nötscher, F. "Zum Emphatischen Lamed," VT III (1953), 372-380.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research," *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, edited by Harold R. Willoughby. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947. Pp. 144-161.

__________. Review of Würthwein, *The Text of the OT*. JSS 4 (1959), 149-51.

__________. "The Textual Criticism of the OT," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, edited by G. E. Wright. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961. Pp. 113-127.

Pedersen, J. "The Rôle Played by Inspired Persons among the Israelites and the Arabs," *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, edited by H. H. Rowley. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. Pp. 127-142.

Pfeiffer, R. H. "Midrash in the Books of Samuel," *Quantalacumque*, edited by R. P. Casey, S. Lake and A. K. Lake. London: Christophers, 1937. Pp. 303-316.

Radermacher, L. "Walfischmythen," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 9 (1906), 248-252.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "Botenformel und Botenspruch," ZAW 74 (1962), 165-177.

Robinson, H. W. "The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality," *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, edited by Paul Volz, F. Stummer, and J. Hempel. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1936. Pp. 49-62.

Ross, James F. "The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger," *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, edited by B. W. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962. Pp. 98-107.

Rowley, H. H. "The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament," Reprinted from the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 33, No. 1, September, 1950.

__________. "The Nature of Prophecy in the Light of Recent Study," HTR 38 (January, 1945), 1-38.

__________. "Ritual and the Hebrew Prophets," Myth, Ritual, and Kingship, edited by S. H. Hooke. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1958. Pp. 236-260.

Ryder, E. T. "Form Criticism of the Old Testament," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, edited by Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1962. Pp. 91-95.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania," JBL (March, 1962), 1-13.

Saydon, P. P. "Assonance in Hebrew as a Means of Expressing Emphasis," Biblica 36 (1955), 36-50.

Scharbert, Josef. "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f und seiner Parallelen," Biblica 38 (1957), 130-150.

Schaumberger, P. J. B. "Das Bussedikt des Königs von Ninive bei Jonas 3, 7.8 in keilschriftlicher Beleuchtung," Miscellanea Biblica, II. Rome: Piazza Della Pilotta, 1934. Pp. 123-134.

Schmidt, Hans. "Die Komposition des Buches Jona," ZAW 25 (1905), 285-310.

Smart, James D. "Introduction and Exegesis of the Book of Jonah," IB VI. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956. Pp. 871-894.

Snaith, N. H. "The Language of the OT," IB I. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1952. Pp. 220-232.

Stanton, Gerald B. "The Prophet Jonah and his Message," BS 108 (April-June, 1951), 238-244; 108 (July-Sept. 1951), 363-376.

Stenzel, Meinrad. "Zum Vulgatatext des Canticum Jonae," Biblica 33 (1952), 356-362.

Stinespring, W. F. "Humor," IDB 2. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 660-662.

__________. "Irony and Satire," IDB 2. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. Pp. 726-728.

Stowe, C. E. "The Prophet Jonah," BS X (Oct. 1853), 739-764.

Talmon S. "A Case of Abbreviation Resulting in Double Readings," VT IV (1954), 206-208.

Terrien, Samuel. "Amos and Wisdom," Israel's Prophetic Heritage, edited by Bernhard W. Anderson and Walter Harrelson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962. Pp. 108-115.

__________. "History of the Interpretation of the Bible; III. Modern Period." IB I. New York: Abingdon Cokesbury Press, 1952. Pp. 127-141.

Thomas, D. Winton. "A Consideration of Some Unusual Ways of Expressing the Superlative in Hebrew," VT III (1953), 209-224.

__________. "The Textual Criticism of the OT," OTMS, edited by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956. Pp. 238-263.

Thomson, James G. S. S. "Sleep: An Aspect of Jewish Anthropology," VT 5 (1955), 421-433.

Trepanier, Benoit. "The Story of Jonas," CBQ 13 (1951), 8-16.

Trumbull, H. Clay. "Jonah in Nineveh," JBL XI (1892), 53-60.

Vincent, J. J. "The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation," *Studia Evangelica*, edited by Kurt Aland *et al*. *Texte und Untersuchungen* LXXIII. Berlin: Akademie, 1959. Pp. 79-99.

Voeltzel, René. "Ironie Biblique a l'Egard de l'Homme," *Foi et Vie* 51 (1953), 208-237.

Vogt, E. "Fragmenta Prophetarum minorum deserti Juda," *Biblica* 34 (1953), 423-26.

Widengren, George. "Early Hebrew Myths and their Interpretation," *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, edited by S. H. Hooke. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1958. Pp. 149-203.

Wilson, Ambrose John. "The Sign of the Prophet Jonah," PTR 25 (1927), 630-642.

Wilson, Robert Dick. "The Authenticity of Jonah," PTR 26 (1918), 280-298; 430-456.

Winckler, Hugo. "Zum buche Jona," *Altorientalische Forschungen*, Series 2, Vol. II. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1900. Pp. 260-265.

Wolfe, Rolland Emerson. "The Editing of the Book of the Twelve," ZAW 53 (1935), 90-129.

Wolff, H. W. "Jonabuch," RGG III. 3rd edition. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. Cols. 854-855.

Wright, Charles Henry Hamilton. "The Book of Jonah considered from an Allegorical Point of View," *Biblical Essays*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1886. Pp. 34-98.

Wright, G. E. "The Study of the Old Testament," *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Arnold S. Nash. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951. Pp. 17-69.

Youtie, Herbert C. "A Codex of Jonah," HTR 38 (1945), 195-197.

Ziegler, Joseph. "Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlagen der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften," *Vorlesungs-Verzeichnis der Staatl Akademie zu Braunsberg*, Ostpr. Winter semester, 1943/44.

__________. "Studien zur Verwertung der Septuaginta im Zwölfprophetenbuch," ZAW (1944), 107-120.

__________. "Der Text der Aldina im Dodekapropheton," *Biblica* 26 (1945), 37-51.

D. Monographs and Pamphlets

Aalder, G. Ch. "The Problem of the Book of Jonah." London: The Tyndale Press, 1948.

Casanowicz, Immanuel M. *Paronomasia in the Old Testament*. Boston: Norwood Press, 1894.

Childs, Brevard S. *Myth and Reality in the OT*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1960.

Coppens, Joseph. *Les Douze Petits Prophètes*. Bruges-Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1950.

Engnell, Ivan. *The Call of Isaiah*. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska, 1949.

Gadd, C. J. *The Fall of Nineveh*. London: The British Museum, 1923.

Gerleman, Gillis. *Zephanja*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1942.

Gunkel, H. *Das Märchen im Alten Testament*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1917.

Haldar, Alfred. *Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells Boktryckeri Ab, 1945.

__________. "The Notion of the Desert in Sumero-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions." Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.

__________. *Studies in the Book of Nahum*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1947.

Haller, Eduard. "Die Erzählung von dem Propheten Jona." *Theologische Existenz Heute* 65. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1958.

Hitzig, Ferdinand. "Des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab." Heidelberg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1831.

Hommel, Fritz. *Die Insel der Seligen in Mythus und Sage der Vorzeit*. München: Hermann Lukaschik, 1901.

Johnson, Aubrey R. "The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel." Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1949.

Johnson, A. R. *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. *Joel Studies*. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells, 1948.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Prophecy and Tradition*. Oslo: I Kommisjon Hos Jacob Dybwad, 1946.

Nielsen, Eduard. *Oral Tradition*: Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1954.

Östborn, Gunnar. *Cult and Canon*. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1950.

Parrot, Andre. *Nineveh and the Old Testament*. Translated by B. E. Hooke. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955.

Posth, Walter. "Es geschah des Herrn Wort." Eine Auslegung des Propheten Jona für unsere Tage. Wuppertal-Barmen: Emil Müller, Evangelischer Verlag, n.d.

Rad, G. von. "Der Prophet Jona." Nürnberg: Laetare, 1950.

__________. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated by David Stalker. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.

Ronner, Pfarrer Max. *Das Buch Jona*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1947.

Schmidt, Hans. *Jona: Eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religiongeschichte*. FRLANT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907.

Smith, George Adam. *The Early Poetry of Israel in its Physical and Social Origins*. London: Oxford University Press, 1912.

Widengren, Geo. *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*. Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska, 1948.

Winckler, Hugo. *Himmels- und Weltenbild der Babylonier*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1903.

Wright, G. E. *God Who Acts*. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 8. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1952.

__________. *The OT Against Its Environment*. Studies in Biblical Theology No. 2. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1954.

Zilz, Walther. "Der unbarmherzige Prophet." Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1955.

E. Unpublished Material

Jackson, Jared. *The Ark Narratives: an historical, textual, and form-critical study of I Samuel 4-6 and II Samuel 6*. Unpublished dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1962.

Kooy, Vernon H. *The Openings of the Former and Latter Prophets*. Unpublished dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, 1953.